

DUBLIN REVIEW.

APRIL, 1865.

Memorial.

A TWO-FOLD debt of filial piety forbids our opening this number with any other topic than that which will long be uppermost in the minds of the Catholics of England. The greatest event since the restoration of the Catholic hierarchy has in these last days fallen upon us. Nicholas Wiseman, the first Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, has passed to his eternal rest. His departure closes a period which will ever be associated with his name.

We say a debt of filial piety, because he was the chief pastor and spiritual father of the whole Flock in England; and we say a two-fold debt, because, in addition to the relation all alike owed to him as Catholics, we, who have endeavoured to sustain the DUBLIN REVIEW, of which he was a joint founder, and from its outset conspicuously the ablest and most illustrious supporter, owe to his memory a kind of domestic piety, a special reverence and affection. It is a joy to us to remember that our last number closed, as if by a presentiment, with a slight outline of his mission in England. In the present we shall refer only to his relation to the DUBLIN REVIEW, and to the circumstances which have made his death and burial a worthy and proportionate end to such a mission.

And first of the DUBLIN REVIEW. The purposes for which it was founded have been so beautifully and so modestly set forth by the Cardinal's own hand, that we cannot refrain from quoting at length.

It was in 1836 that the idea of commencing a Catholic quarterly was first conceived by the late learned and excellent Mr. Quin, who applied to the illustrious O'Connell and myself to join in the undertaking. I was in England only for a short time, and saw the difficulty of connecting myself with an enterprise so far removed from my permanent residence in Rome. Still I saw the importance of such an organ of Catholic principles and sentiments, and gladly consented to become a member of this little association. The first number appeared in May, 1836, before I left this country. The two gentlemen with whom I was associated were laymen: the one living in the very whirlpool of existing politics, the other a man of letters, with a prospect, I believe, of receiving an important foreign employment from Government; both were sincerely attached to their faith and Church. I considered myself as associated to represent the theological and religious elements in the journal, and to secure to its pages soundness of doctrine. It was understood to be a condition of this association, that no extreme political views should be introduced into the Review; and this condition has, in most trying times, been faithfully observed.

A few years of separation virtually, and afterwards death most really, sundered this bond; and I find myself the only survivor of those who began an undertaking that has grown to some magnitude—looking back through thirty-three volumes, or sixty-seven numbers, of a periodical work, undertaken for a great purpose, and having to account for my share of responsibility in it, and answer whether I have remained faithful to its first principles, and steady to its object.

While obeying the suggestions of others, by preparing the present publication, I have had ample opportunity of examining this question; and I trust I may be indulged if I make such observations upon it as may throw light upon the collection of papers here reprinted.

The moment when I was invited to join in this new review appeared to me most critical and interesting. Three years before, had begun to manifest themselves the germs of that wonderful movement which, originating at Oxford, was destined to pervade and agitate the Anglican Establishment, till it should give up many of its most loving and gifted sons to the Catholic Church; peculiar circumstances, allusion to which will be found in a note in Vol. ii., pp. 93 and 102, had made me at Rome previously acquainted with the rise and progress of this great religious revolution; and I had been surprised, on visiting England in 1835, to find how little attention it had yet excited among Catholics, though many *Tracts for the Times* had already appeared, and Dr. Whately had sung out to their writers, "*Tendimus in Latium*." It was, indeed, impossible for any one to foresee what might be the final results of so new and strange a commotion in the hitherto stagnant element of the state religion. Even now, after twenty years, and notwithstanding the many great consequences which have already issued from it, its

activity is not exhausted. The impulse given by the first *Tract* still urges on the body which it struck ; and it will roll forward for a long time to come, while fragments detach themselves, and run before it, towards the goal which we pray it may all attain. But even in that first bud of the rising power, it was impossible for a calm and hopeful eye not to see new signs in the religious firmament, which it became a duty to observe, unless one wished to incur the Divine reproach, addressed to those who note not the providential warnings and friendly omens of the spiritual heavens. For Catholics to have overlooked all this, and allowed the wonderful phenomenon to pass by, not turned to any useful purpose, but gazed at, till it died out, would have been more than stupidity, it would have been wickedness. To watch its progress, to observe its phases, to influence, if possible, its direction, to move it gently towards complete attainment of its unconscious aims ; and, moreover, to protest against its errors, to warn against its dangers, to provide arguments against its new modes of attack, and to keep lifted up the mask of beauty under which it had, in sincerity, covered the ghastly and soulless features of Protestantism ; these were the duties which the new Review undertook to perform, or which, in no small degree, it was expressly created to discharge. And the necessity of attending to these new duties formed the strongest inducement to myself to undertake its theological direction.

At the same time, Catholics had begun to recover from that first torpor, which benumbs, for a time, the limbs just freed from fetters. Signs of a more active circulation had shown themselves : communities were springing up ; schools were beginning to be multiplied ; new missions were opened ; churches, upon a scale of size and of embellishment previously unknown, were contemplated or begun ; and the people were evidently manifesting more interest in our religion, and a more fair disposition to hear and judge it justly. It seemed the favourable moment to strike another chord, and stir up a spirit yet slumbering, but ready to awake. The Catholic religion as she is in the fulness of her growth, with the grandeur of her ritual, the beauty of her devotions, the variety of her institutions, required to be made more known to many who had never seen her other than she had been reduced, by three hundred years of barbarous persecution.

It was therefore with a strong desire, and a sincere determination, to make the DUBLIN REVIEW the organ and the promoter of Catholic progress, within and without ; it was with a conscientious resolution that its theology should belong to the present day,—that is, should treat of living questions and existing controversies—should grapple with real antagonists, wrestle with tangible errors, that I agreed to turn from studies long pursued, and ardently cherished, to the anxious care and desultory occupation involved in the direction of such a publication. Works not only long contemplated, but for which materials had been gathered with diligence, were given up at this period, in consequence of time and attention being more required for passing events and current literature.

I cannot indeed, without ingratitude, reject the consolations received from effects attributed to them ; for I fear that my readers will wonder sometimes at finding wants mentioned now so well supplied, and feelings suggested long become so familiar, that the very memory of our deficiencies

has faded away. More than half a generation has passed by since those passages were written, which now describe an unknown state of things. And if their words had some influence in producing the change, their power lay in this alone—that they were sincere, cordial, and affectionate descriptions of realities often witnessed by the writer, deeply admired, and tenderly loved: they were words of truth and of charity, which ever bear with them their own evidences and convictions, straight to the minds of all.

That the many imperfections of so miscellaneous a collection may be elaborately investigated and severely handled, I am fully prepared to expect. I have long ceased to anticipate fair dealing from those who look upon me as an enemy, and think it their duty to treat me as such. Custom, however, inures us to this; and I trust that I shall have patience to bear it to the end. And nothing helps one more to this than a consciousness that no bitterness of thought, or personal rancour, or desire to wound, has guided one's own pen or intentions. Should any words of mine suggest a different impression I shall sincerely regret it.

With these words of peace, I take leave of my courteous reader; wishing him, from above, all grace and blessing, as I bid him to implore for me all mercy and forgiveness.

Easter, MDCCCLIII.

But it is not our purpose now to say more of this special bond which binds us to his memory. We do so only out of veneration and gratitude, and from a deep sense of the service rendered in these last thirty years to the Catholic Church in England by the DUBLIN REVIEW, and, therefore, by him who was by far its chief strength and ornament. In the last two years since it passed into other hands the declining health of our lamented Cardinal compelled him to postpone again and again the kind and encouraging promises he made to us of contributions from his pen. No line written by him has therefore appeared in it; and though most kindly watched and approved by him, this Review has had no other relation to or dependence on our most eminent Pastor. And here we leave this subject, adding only one word. If at the end of our labours the second series of the DUBLIN REVIEW should yield from all the hands which may contribute to it three volumes of essays worthy to stand afar off by those of Cardinal Wiseman for beauty, variety, learning, freshness, originality, and, above all, for pure, solid Catholic doctrine and high filial devotion to Rome, we shall hope that we have not failed in the trust which he has bequeathed to us.

We have said that the withdrawal from us not only of the foremost man of the Catholic hierarchy in England, but one of the chief lights of the Sacred College, and, therefore, of the Church throughout the world, is an event which closes a period. It does so. The man chosen for the restoration

of the hierarchy, and its first organic development, is gone. The hierarchy now passes under the ordinary conditions of the Church in all other lands. The pastors who rule over it will be surely and wisely chosen for its guidance; but the period of its restoration, with all its throes and trials, is past.

This eventful period of fifteen years both opened and closed with a popular movement, exceptional in its character and extent. It opened with a tempest: it closed with a great mourning. It is strange that the same man should have been the object and the centre of both. Fifteen years of open, manly bearing—fifteen years of unspotted life and of high Christian virtues, have sufficed to win the confidence, admiration, and sympathy of the English people. Conspicuous as he was in the dignity of his name, he was almost unseen by his personal retirement and quietness of life. Except in the ecclesiastical acts which compelled him to speak or appear as Archbishop and Metropolitan, no man ever lived more unobtrusively, or less exposed himself to public gaze. When invited to any act which would instruct or give pleasure to the English people, no man was ever more prompt and kindly. And yet this is the man who, from 1850 to 1860, was described habitually by many who never saw him, or never heard so much as a word from his lips, in terms and titles which, if we could, we would not reproduce. We shall freely use our privilege to say that if the leading articles of the chief newspapers which in those ten years described his Eminence the late Cardinal—his opinions, his pastorals, his pretensions, his aims, and we know not what,—were reprinted in parallel columns with the leading articles of those same papers during the last six weeks, we should have before us a strange memorial of human infirmity, but no strange example of English honesty and truth. It would be no unkindly admonition to anonymous writers if we were to do so; and many would be wiser men for it. We remember a case in point. During the excitement of the Papal aggression, all the bishops of the Establishment in succession denounced the Catholic Hierarchy. A quiet person with scissors cut out and pasted together the chief flowers and formulas of Episcopal vituperation. They were then distributed into categories, and graduated according to their intensity. They were somewhat like the gamut, a slender provision of few notes, but capable of almost endless combination. "Unwarranted, aggressive, usurping;" "insolent, intolerable, anti-Christian;" "anti-Christian, usurping, and insolent;" "insolent, intolerable, and aggressive." It began, like a symphony of Beethoven, with a single deep note; then two, then one again, then a chord, then a compli-

cation and a volume of sound. When once printed in order, and set before educated men, no comment was needed. The experiment has not been tried again. So we believe it was with the late illustrious Cardinal. He was a Roman Catholic; he was a Cardinal; he came from the Pope of Rome; he was born in Spain; he was Irish by race; he was an Archbishop in England without our leave, and head of an Episcopate not known to the Crown. He must be designing, crafty, overbearing, superstitious, un-English, covetous, grasping, ambitious, ignorant of England, an alien,—the paid envoy of a foreign sovereign. It needed no proof, no evidence, no sign: all was certain as day. So for ten years men wrote of him in public, spoke of him in private, and, worst of all, believed of him, without caring or wishing to know better. What has wrought the change? From time to time he was seen and heard. Here and there, first one, then another came across him. Kindly, sympathizing words were caught up from his lips; charitable and secret actions got abroad. It was felt, and therefore found, that the man had a heart, and could feel for others as well as be wounded—could show kindness, as well as suffer unkindness.

Then came a period which conciliated for him much generous feeling—the last five years of almost continual suffering. It was well known that a mortal malady had struck him; and much sympathy from all parts of England, and from the least likely persons, was manifested towards him. Men of all religious opinions—clergymen of the Church of England, Dissenting ministers, wrote to him or to his friends, inclosing prescriptions, and expressing their kindly regard. A great appreciation was shown for the life which ten years before was threatened by public danger. It was during these five years of declining strength, and while those about him advised that he should unbend his mind in all possible ways, that he gave the lectures on art, on industry, on self-cultivation, on architecture, and the like, which have made his name and the memory of his presence dear to a multitude in London, and in many of our larger towns, where a few years ago he was carried about in effigy. Highly honourable all this to the great heart and mind of Cardinal Wiseman, and honourable also to the English people. Englishmen may misunderstand each other for a time—perhaps for a long time; but we hardly know an example in which the most violent antipathies and animosities have not been at last lived down. Sometimes men who have been railed upon and assaulted on every side for years, have won to themselves an equal respect and benevolence in their latter days. The only exception we know to this is where the popular odium is just, and the man worthy

of it. And yet even in this extreme case, there is about the people of England a natural compassion, and a readiness to condone or to be blind to faults which sometimes absolves even the unworthy. But in the case of great men and good men, who suffer for fidelity to their principles, without, perhaps, yielding a shade of opposition to their principles, Englishmen at last are just and kindly. They give and take; and as they claim to think for themselves in religion, so they granted willingly to our great and large-hearted Cardinal the unmolested profession of his Tridentine and Ultramontane principles. We say this was honourable on both sides, because we do not venture to argue from the change of feeling towards the late lamented Cardinal that English public opinion has approximated to his tenets; and all the world is witness how, as one of the public notices of him truly said, "he had never changed the colour of one feather in his Ultramontanism."

First, then, we would remark upon the almost unanimous expression of admiration, respect, and sympathy, and we must say, of English national pride, which has shown itself in the last two months around the closing days of this great man.

We pass over the exceptions, very few as they are, from veneration to his greatness, over which such nameless aspersions cannot cast so much as a momentary shade. We should dishonour him by defending him.

Still less shall we notice expressions here and there, well intended so far as good will, but neither true nor just. We forget the mistakes for the sake of the intention.

But of the great majority of the notices which have appeared in the public papers we can but have one feeling. They were honourable both to the subject and to the writers; and they give proof that the people of England can respect and even love sincerity, reality, and consistency, in those who are most opposed to their opinions.

We read in this fact certain great counsels very wholesome to us all, most of all to those who, being still young, have the happiness of a long life before them, in which to serve God and his Church in England.

The life and death of Cardinal Wiseman may teach us that compromise is not the way to win the English people. Englishmen do not understand compromise. They do not understand a man being in earnest except for what he believes to be true. And they still less understood his playing fast and loose with what he affirms that he believes. They perfectly understand his fighting for it. To give and take hard knocks for it is logic to us. There is philosophy and theology in

honest, manly fight. It is to most of us if not a proof that our adversary is right, at least a pledge that he is sincere.

Again, the respect and affection which have surrounded the last days of the Cardinal, is a proof that the highest and strongest principles in faith may be combined with the most kindly and benevolent bearing. We believe we may say that among the English Protestants he has not left an enemy. We can confidently say from our own personal knowledge of facts that he has left a multitude of friends and of friendly hearts.

His great career, beginning in storm, and ending in so much calm, teaches us all this sure and salutary lesson, that unpopular truth always in the end prevails over popular illusions; and they who have the courage to stand for it, and are not afraid when they enter into the cloud, shall as surely come forth from it before the end, as the sun which is over their heads.

But even these spontaneous expressions of respect and benevolence did not prepare us for the events which passed from the 15th to the 23rd of February last.

As soon as it was known that all that remained to us of our great Cardinal Archbishop lay arrayed in his Pontifical vestments in the humble and modest dwelling where his latter years were passed, immediately a multitude of people began to assemble. For days the crowd was so great that many after long waiting went away without so much as entering the door of the house. Not only Catholics who were drawn by faith and by charity once more into the presence of the form which they knew so well, but many of those who are unhappily "not of this fold," asked admittance with the greatest desire and respect. We doubt whether there has been any "lying in state" which has awakened such heartfelt sorrow, or drawn together a greater concourse through so many days.

But this public mourning was only in its beginning. On the evening before the day of the burial the solemn dirge was to be sung in the pro-cathedral of S. Mary's, Moorfields. The coffin was then removed to that place. It is said that thirty thousand persons on that day went through the church by the bier, passing out by the door of the house attached to the cathedral. The multitudes were so great that it was impossible to allow them to kneel or to linger. Persons were placed by the bier to touch the coffin with their rosaries and the like, and to press them onwards. But even this did not prepare for the next day. We have no powers of description; and the subject has been already exhausted. The outline, and even the minutest detail of that great day of public mourning, has been recorded by the Protestant papers of England. The mass of solemn

requiem none who saw and heard it will ever forget. It was in solemnity, grandeur, and pathos all that the burial of a great pastor and prince of the Church of God ought to be.

Then began the strangest sight which England has seen for three hundred years—a funeral procession more than miles in length; the whole Catholic hierarchy of England, with some hundreds of the priesthood, conducting the remains of their archbishop and metropolitan to the grave. Along the whole line of road from the cathedral, for four or five miles, a crowd of people of every class and condition stood closely together on either side of the street. The greatest order, silence, and respect prevailed. As the funeral car passed, all heads were bared. The multitude at the Cemetery was still more dense. Without doubt the desire to see a great and strange pageant brought many there that day. Among the crowds there must have been many who had no special feeling of sympathy and condolence with the mourning of that funeral. Nevertheless, after all this has been said, there remains a fact which nothing can diminish, which no one has affected to explain away, which even the hostile witnesses have recorded, that such a funeral has never been seen except in Royal burials, nor in our days since the funeral of the Duke of Wellington. We do not know that any form of speech could be found to go beyond this, or to fix more vividly the facts of that day. We should not have ventured to use them. Had we done so, we should have been held up to ridicule for the exaggeration and grandiloquence of a handful aping the proportions and talking the language of a people. But the fact was so. Date the days when any personage in England was borne forth to burial with such manifestation of—call it what you will—mourning, sympathy, respect, or bare recognition. In our lifetime an Anglican Bishop of London, who had been publicly known to the population of that city during a longer incumbency than the eighteen years' episcopate of Cardinal Wiseman, was carried to his grave. He was a learned, cultivated, eloquent, benevolent, exceedingly laborious, large-minded, and warm-hearted man. He was surrounded by all the traditions and circumstances with which the Church and State of England could invest him. He deserved at their hands a great and noble manifestation of affection and respect; he had served them so as we remember no other to have done. He wore himself out in their service. His last years were especially touching. Broken with faithful toil for the Anglican Church in London, he withdrew to await his end in feebleness and out of sight. We are glad in passing to bear this testimony to one whose personal memory is, and ever will be, dear to many who

were parted from him. And yet when he passed to his grave the stir and business of London held on its way. He deserved another response, but it was not in the millions of London to give it. Again, two archbishops of Canterbury have been borne to their burial. Did London rise up to meet them? Were the roads lined for miles? Were there thousands and tens of thousands for days before Lambeth Palace?

There have been many men of great popularity, rank, and name buried in Westminster Abbey in these last twenty years. What one man has awakened—kindled, we may say—such a wide-spread sense of his death, and of his burial, as the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster?

We may now appreciate the exquisite delicacy and felicity of the following words from the leading article of the *Morning Post*, February 24:—

Against Roman Cardinals, Westminster, and Canterbury, and Lambeth, are apparently closed for ever; and amid all the pomp which has characterised the present obsequies, nothing can have thrown a greater chill upon the ceremonial than the remembrance that those great shrines which were once in Catholic hands are uniformly closed, in death as in life, to the priestly emissaries of the Church of Rome. The pageant of yesterday, with all its imposing ceremonial, was the pageant of an ostracised religion.

Why, St. Paul's, and Canterbury, and Westminster Abbey, altogether, have not been able to produce, except for one great soldier, such a public mourning. It extended over ten days. The Holy Mass was, indeed, offered in an obscure Catholic Cathedral; but hundreds of thousands followed all the way to a green burial ground, hardly known by name to the upper classes of London. We say the admonition is delicate, because, translated, it means, "Remember, we have even the graves of your Fathers. You shall not even rest by them after death." There is something intimately bland, generous, and human in this.

And it is as signally felicitous in the mouth of those who, with all the glories of the Catholic Church in their hands, cannot surround their great, or noble, or splendid dead with a tithe of the reverence which carried the pall of the first Archbishop of Westminster. Men may build sepulchres in Westminster Abbey, but they cannot touch the heart of a populace. It needs a higher power to do this. The same paper already quoted has unconsciously, and by an amusing inversion of its intention, exactly touched the point. It said:—"The present effort was certainly a great one for an unrecognized Church."

For an "unrecognized Church?" Why, surely the Anglican Church is recognized, and yet it has never produced

such a demonstration. But, perhaps, the Catholic Church is a recognized body after all, and for that reason did and can always produce a demonstration proportionate to the facts and circumstances of the event. The Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster was a person recognized throughout Christendom, even where the name of the Archbishops of Canterbury has not been recognized for three centuries. The Catholic nations of the world knew him by name and by form; and recognized him as the Chief Pastor of the scattered flock in England. They recognize, too, the body over which he presided as the Catholic Church in these realms, with which they have conscious unity of heart, mind, will, fortunes, sorrows and joys. It was this world-wide recognition of the Catholic Church in England which told upon London and upon England whether they would or no. A Catholic Archbishop and a Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church may be legislated against, legally exiled, ignored, extinguished. "*Mergas profundo, pulchrior evenit.*" The world knows him, and knows nobody else in his place. His titles are ineffaceable, because his character is indelible. All the legal recognition upon earth could not create another Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. There are two other kinds of recognition wider and truer than the recognition of legislatures, springing from a higher and from a deeper fountain—the one is of the Church throughout the world; the other is the public consciousness of a people even in its hostility; and these two unite in the recognition of the Catholic Church and hierarchy in England. Nevertheless, the critic was partly in the right. That day of public mourning was a wonderful event, springing from no adequate material cause. It was not got up by vote of Parliament, nor by an act of Prerogative, nor by the organisation of public agencies and public funds. It was the simple act of the Metropolitan Chapter and Clergy of Westminster, out of their poverty, giving burial to their Archbishop. Even the dignity of Cardinal added hardly an appreciable element in the provision and order of that day. They carried him out to burial with all simplicity. The funeral array was majestic for its vastness and continuity: not for any display of unusual costliness. The car was not like the stupendous funeral throne which now lies buried under the dome of St. Paul's. It was simple, open, slender, bare: and was criticized by the *Times* for its meanness. We are so much the better pleased. The majesty of that burial train was altogether such as became a Pastor, and a great Pastor of the Church. And, as it went along, it carried the hearts of a hierarchy, a priesthood, and a flock along with it. And a

multitude of the English people to whom the Catholic Church in England is as much a recognized fact as the Anglican Establishment—we refrain now willingly from saying much more which crowds upon us—stood by, or followed in kindly and reverent sympathy. There were, doubtless, there many who are far from us in their religious convictions, yet they have learned to recognize and to respect manliness, zeal, hard work for souls and for the poor, industry in duty, fidelity to conscience. They, too, could look on with kindness. Many were there who, though not even near to the Catholic Church, have been long healed of the blindness which once made them hate or fear it: many, too, whose hearts feel kindly to it, as the Church of the poor, and in London eminently the Church which makes itself seen, known, felt, and trusted by multitudes of the most destitute and suffering of our people. All these, and many other classes of minds which we cannot stay to enumerate, were to be found in the great concourse which streamed along those miles of street. But there was, as we believe, still another sense awakened. One who passed through them as a mourner said truly, as we believe, “I was convinced that, whether they knew it or not, multitudes felt that day, as they looked upon the funeral procession, ‘This was the old religion of England. This was once the religion of our fathers.’” They who had read the history of their country could recall memories of Pole, Wolsey, and Langton. They who were simplest saw before them the living presence of the great Catholic Church which once filled the land. The English poor have it as a proverb, “The Catholic religion was the first religion, and will be the last.” Its reappearance on that day in such wide-spread sympathy of men of every class preached to them on that homely prophecy. What Nicholas Wiseman had prayed, laboured, and suffered to do, he did that day more powerfully and more persuasively than ever before. He had spent his life to make the people of England know and love once more the Church of their fathers; that day was the noblest and worthiest close to such a life. And thus we leave him with the tribute of our grateful and loving veneration, as the dusk of evening made more purely bright the tapers around his grave, greater in its humility than all the glories of Westminster, as it now is, where S. Edward, whom he loved so well, still holds his own for God, and for the future—so we leave him as the *Miserere* is ascending to heaven like the voice of many waters, sweet, plaintive, but strong as the hope of the Church in England, as the truths he has taught us, and as his prayers, which ascend for us before the eternal throne.

ART. I.—THE PRINCIPLES OF '89.—POLITICAL
SOCIETY AND THE SOURCE OF POWER.

Les Principes de '89 et la Doctrine Catholique. Par M. l'Abbé LÉON GODARD, Professeur d'Histoire Ecclésiastique au Grand Séminaire de Langres, Chanoine Honoraire d'Alger. Édition corrigée et augmentée. Paris : Lecoffre. 1863.

Essai Théorique de Droit Naturel, basé sur les Faits. Par le R. P. TAPARELLI D'AZEGLIO, de la Compagnie de Jésus. Traduit de l'Italien, d'après la dernière édition, avec approbation de l'auteur. 4 vols. Paris : Casterman. 1858.

SECOND CONFERENCE.

PROFESSOR. Our object, as the Padre observed at our last sitting, being discussion rather than dispute, we must leave old points of difference behind, contented with having defined, limited, and, in some measure, we may hope, diminished their number. Of course, I can only speak for myself, but I must own to having been impressed so far by what our good Padre said in conclusion, as to be ready to allow that his objection to liberal opinions is in some respects rather to the manner in which they have been proposed than to the matter of them. We disciples of '89 would claim the honour of their invention ; the Church, of which our Padre is a staunch—nay, as I should call him, a rigid—representative, cannot allow that any principles or opinions which benefit or have benefited mankind are of human invention, but maintains that all are of divine derivation, in so far as they are pure, genuine, and true.

Marquis. I suspect you will find no reciprocity on the part of our honoured friend and president. He looks to discussion for clearing the ground and establishing differences broadly and clearly. Here (agreeing, of course, as Catholics, in all essential points) he and I differ considerably in our views. I believe that much may be done towards filling up the breach between the Church of all ages and the liberal school of the day—between Catholicism, in short, and the Revolution : taking that word in a sense exclusive of the evil passions of the agents by whom it has been so often carried out. For none is more willing than myself to admit that there is a very evil spirit abroad, attempting to abuse the principles of the Revolution to the destruction of religion and social order. On the other hand, numbers, decoyed by the legitimate objects

which these men hold out to the natural aspirations of humanity, follow in their wake; and this the more eagerly because Catholics so often confound the good and the evil of the new order of things, and include all and everything which in principle has its parentage in '89, in one undistinguishing anathema. The new order of things is irreparable, whether welcome or not: I am a man of my day, and accept it *ex animo*.

Padre. All and everything which in principle has its parentage in '89 we certainly do repudiate emphatically. However, one of the great objects of our discussion I consider is, not to establish our differences as the Marquis expresses it, but to ascertain our real points of difference; or, rather (as I proposed at starting), to examine how far the Principles of '89 are reconcilable with those of the Church, or what is the rational and juridical sentence which, as Catholics, we must pronounce upon them. In order to do this, and indeed in all arguments, it is needful to clear up any ambiguity which may result from the different use of the same terms. The enemies of the Church have forged a weapon against her by using terms in their own, that is, a false sense; the consequence of which is that the general mind becomes altogether confused on the subject. For instance, "The Church repudiates the opinions of the so-called liberals," is made synonymous with this other proposition, "The Church condemns liberal principles." So far is this from being the case that it is, on the contrary, to the Church that men are indebted for all true liberality.

Prof. Well, that is very much what I stated to be your view, however little I may grant you the right to hold it.

Pad. We probably differ, not only as to the origin of the constitutive principles of social and political freedom, but as to their nature. We proceed to inquire to-day, whether (according to the Declaration) "the end of every political society is the preservation of the natural and imprescriptible rights of man;" and, whether these rights are correctly summed up as "liberty, security, and the right of resistance to oppression." I must observe, first, that when legislators turned propounders of philosophical theses, one of the inevitable inconveniences resulting was that their theories could be disputed and rejected, as all speculative propositions may be; and this inconvenience was aggravated by the liberty granted to every one, not only to think as he pleased (a liberty none can either grant or take away), but to publish, both in words and in print, whatever he thought. A constitution based on speculative propositions must accordingly be very fragile and liable to be overthrown. If this piece of imprudence scarcely surprises us in the three hundred and seventy-four lawyers who dominated in the

Constituent Assembly, and who played the reckless game of '89, it may well be matter of marvel why it was thought necessary to follow their example in 1852, and lay the same unstable foundation for the Imperial Constitution.

Abbé. It was required by the state of public opinion in France. Amongst us there prevails a very general persuasion that all liberty, whether political or social, dates from '89. Our tradition mounts no higher: we have broken with the past, and, though many may lament that a portion of what was swept away was not retained, the idea is universal that some great victory was then achieved, some grand principle asserted, some valuable acquisition made. This now traditional reverence for '89 is a fact to be dealt with, not set aside. It has taken the place of the reverence for old laws and institutions, which is so powerful a national element of character where no sweeping change has intervened. My observations, of course, do not apply to a daily diminishing party which still clings with fond regret and unextinguishable, though waning, hope to a departed order of things.

Pad. It was thought advisable, doubtless, to retain what was so blindly valued by the nation at large; and, just as the first emperors of Rome made a large show of outward reverence for republican forms and names, knowing well that it was their policy to preserve them, while, as a fact, all the power might be and was centred in their own persons, so also Napoleon III. might be perfectly aware that it was much easier to rule France with irresponsible and arbitrary power than make her part with her charter of '89. Nor was any such hazardous attempt really needed, for when a man has 500,000 bayonets at his disposal he can well afford to hold forth seventeen propositions to public admiration, and rest assured that there is little danger of seeing them either practically refuted, or interpreted in any way which would inconvenience the propounder. But upon this subject I shall have something to say by-and-by. For the present we will consider the first of the two assertions of the second Article—"That the end of every political society is the preservation of the natural and imprescriptible rights of man."

Abbé. We may, I think, let this pass as a truth, albeit an incomplete truth. All violation of the natural rights of man, every obstacle thrown in the way of his peaceable enjoyment of those rights, is an injustice, which it becomes the duty of the political society to hinder or repress. Peace secured by justice, such is the end of political organization. The power of commanding and the duty of obeying, essential to all such organization, have this end for their object. Suarez

himself takes no other view.* Society does not destroy but protects the natural rights of man. S. Thomas also represents the multitude of free men, free in virtue of natural liberty, *multitudo liberorum*, as preserving this title in the political pact which has justice for its basis: *Regimen rectum et justum quale convenit liberis*.† Bellarmine uses similar language, and shows that our natural liberty is opposed not to political submission, but to subjection to despotism. The citizen is governed for his own advantage, not for the advantage of his ruler. Again, security, or the assurance of life and of the peaceable enjoyment of his lawful possessions being also the natural right of the citizen, society is bound to protect him in it. For, as S. Thomas tells us, the political community is ordered with the view of procuring for man in sufficient measure all that is necessary to life.‡ The assertion of the Declaration errs, however, in deficiency, because the end of political organization is not merely the protection of natural and imprescriptible rights. We look to society, politically constituted, for much beyond mere security from injustice and oppression. It ought to furnish us with the means of improving our condition, physically, morally, and intellectually.

Prof. If society is bound to do this (and I am far from denying its obligation in this respect), we have only to enlarge our view of the rights of man. Man has undoubtedly a natural right to his share in the goods procurable in every order, and they may be considered to be included virtually in the general terms of the proposition. It is from this principle that we derive the doctrine of the "right to labour," which is nothing less than the right to the means of subsistence; the right of being represented in the governing body, which finds its full exponent in universal suffrage; the right to instruction—a right, however, which man is often so slow to assert that it is the growing opinion of our liberals that primary instruction ought to be made obligatory.

Pad. But your legislators of '89 have themselves limited the list of natural rights to "liberty, security, and resistance

* "Homo naturâ suâ propensus ad civilem societatem, eâque ad convenientem hujus vitæ conservationem maximè indiget. . . . Non potest autem communitas hominum sine justitiâ et pace conservari, neque justitia et pax sine gubernatore. . . . Si plures essent nec inter se nec alteri subordinati, fieri nullo modo posset ut unitas seu concordia et obedientia cum justitiâ et pace conservarentur, ut per se satis notum est."—*Defensio Fidei*, lib. iii. c. 1.

† *De Regimine Principum*, lib. i. c. 1.

‡ "Communitas politica ea est quæ ad hoc ordinatur, quod homo habeat sufficienter quicquid est necessarium ad vitam, sive quæ habet sufficientiam vitæ."—*Polit.*, lib. i. lect. 1.

to oppression." We must not diverge from our text. Nothing, I consider, can more forcibly exhibit the imperfect idea possessed by these legislators of civil society, than the assertion that the end of civil society is the preservation or defence of natural rights. In fact, we everywhere perceive that Rousseau's *Contrat Social* is uppermost in their minds. For, unless we were to admit his theory of the primitive savage man, or Hobbes's conceit of a normal state of universal warfare, not a single plausible reason could be advanced in support of this thesis. The supposition upon which it is founded, is that men deliberately entered into an agreement to constitute themselves in the social state, in order to provide a defence from the evils and dangers which were the consequence of their natural condition of isolation. Such is the fundamental conception of Rousseau's *Contrat Social*. I consider this proposition therefore as an error, not merely as an imperfect truth. Certainly the protection of the rights of the individuals composing it is one of the results and objects of the social and political state, and protection is one of the duties of society towards its members; but the defence of natural rights is not the end of civil society. Then what do you think of the enunciation of those rights as respects completeness? M. l'Abbé may well suggest that the list is meagre. We should certainly opine, for instance, that a citizen whose house was on fire might reasonably think he had a claim on society for some assistance, and that its duties towards him were hardly discharged, by leaving him in full freedom of person and secure possession of his property, with a recognized right of resistance to oppression, including that which threatens him from his falling walls.

Prof. A jest is not an argument; and, excuse me for saying so, your jest is nothing to the purpose. The security guaranteed may well be taken to include assistance in any danger.

Pad. Let this pass, then; we will admit the term in its most comprehensive sense. About this same right to resist oppression, I shall have something to say by-and-by, but I wish to draw your attention first to the anomaly of making society the guardian of such a right. Society, of course, can only maintain and defend it as it maintains and defends other rights; that is, by means of the constituted power. Now, if it be the political power itself which becomes the oppressor (and it is not easy to see how any other can become so), what then? Can it be expected, is it possible that authority should defend in citizens the right of resisting itself? Suppose, for instance, the French were to consider themselves oppressed by their Imperial Government, would

you expect the Government to protect its subjects in the exercise of that right? The very idea involves an absurd contradiction. However, this by the way, we will return to the consideration of the scope and end of civil society.

Abbé. No one troubles himself much nowadays about the *Contrat Social*. Without reverting then to that theory, let us consider man in his original condition, as his Creator formed him.

Pad. And not as our modern sophists have arrogantly pretended to re-form him.

Abbé. Just so. Now, as I have already remarked, it is certainly not erroneous to say that the preservation of rights is one of the objects of the social state—indeed, you admitted thus much: only let it be granted that it is not the *sole* object.

Pad. Nor the *ultimate* object: in proof of this, one simple consideration suffices. The necessity for the defence of rights amongst men is an accidental, not an essential condition of their nature. Abstractedly we can imagine men free from this imperfection; but it is evident that to men even as thus conceived—that is, without any need of protection—the social state would, by the very condition of their nature, be still absolutely necessary; which is proof positive that this necessity has its source in a deeper principle, and one more intimately connected with human nature. In short, if it is the natural condition of man to be a sociable creature, *civile animal*, as Aristotle has it, we cannot assign as the object of that condition something in him which is only accidental and hypothetical.

Prof. It seems to me that you confound the social condition with social or political organization. Men, of course, might have herded together for the pleasure or profit of mutual society under any circumstances. It is the organization of society as a polity which has the protection of rights for its object.

Pad. Pardon me, I make no such confusion: the aggregation you describe would not constitute a social condition. A flock of sheep may prefer keeping together in a pasture, and may take a pleasure in each other's company. But a flock, a herd, a company, is not a society. The term implies a certain organization in which law and order prevail. Beginning with the domestic polity, the family, and proceeding to the constitutional, the municipal, and all other secondary polities, which are summed up and included in the state, they have all this characteristic. Law and government have no merely penal and repressive object: neither is this object the great end of society, which (observe) always presupposes some kind of government, however simple and rudimentary, as we find it existing where the social state is imperfectly and loosely constituted. Civil

society is, in fact, not an arbitrary human institution : God has so formed man that he cannot attain the end or perfection of his nature without living in society with his fellow man. As the imperfect must always tend to the perfect, so it follows that man is naturally designed (*vi suæ naturæ*) for this association with his fellow men. It was not necessary, however, to wait till 1789 to discover the scope of civil society ; indeed, all that was done in that memorable year was but to distort and obscure what before was clear and plain. Aristotle taught it, and after him S. Thomas and all the Christian theologians and philosophers, with that additional fulness and perfection which rational truths have acquired from their contact with revelation. Nor does it require much intellectual acumen or philosophical research to be convinced of this truth. We have only to reflect what man would be without society, which is indispensable even to his physical being ; since he could not be reared in the absence of the first cares bestowed on his infancy, and these cares he would lack without some kind of domestic society. But apart from this consideration, let us but ask ourselves what he would be abandoned to himself in utter solitude. His state would be far inferior to that of the most degraded savage ; little better, in short, than that of the brutes. Is it conceivable that God should have so largely endowed the mind of man with intellectual powers and capacities, and above all, have bestowed on him the gift of language, and not have intended him for society, the only means of developing these gifts, or affording them their proper exercise ? Well did Aristotle say that he alone ought to live separated from the society of other men who, from his extreme depravity, was unfit for their company ; or who, by his eminent self-sufficiency, needed it not ; concluding, in his laconic style, *Quare aut bestia est aut Deus*.

Prof. I am quite willing to throw the primitive savage overboard, in company with Rousseau's wild man of the woods. These are philosophical figments which may or may not be true ; at any rate, they are simple conjectures made to account for known facts, and as such, legitimate in their proper place. But although we Germans are accused of an over-partiality to theory, I am content to confine myself in the present argument to the facts. I take man as he is ; I do not ask how he became what he is. I leave this question to the philosophers and the theologians ; they may fight it out between them. Granting, however, all you insist upon—viz., the development of man's intellect, his initiation into the arts of life, and so forth,—I do not see but that the family meets all the requirements. Let the family pass : we are speaking of a civil polity, and I cannot

allow that its proper end is the perfection of man's nature ; the protection of his rights, I contend, forms its adequate scope. All I will grant is that he could not attain the perfection of his nature without this security. But it is not fair, therefore, I opine, to call this perfection its ultimate end. Man could not well attain this perfection if he lacked shelter from the weather, or a covering for his body ; but we should not say that moral perfection was the end of house and clothing.

Pad. These things are needful to his bodily well-being—nay, to his physical preservation,—and, as such, are conditions of higher things, and of the attainment of its one great end. But the scope of society embraces the whole perfection of man's nature, physical, moral, intellectual, religious.

Mar. Is it true to make the end of civil society the religious or spiritual perfection of man ? I ask for information's sake, pretending as I do to no great philosophical or theological knowledge.

Pad. The immediate end of civil society is external order, directed to the temporal felicity, but subordinated to the ultimate end of man. Man has one end, not two ends ; and society would be no good to him if it did not harmonize with his supreme good ; which, in fact, is the very reason of his own existence. The perfection of man can only be imperfectly attained by the family, which resembles civil society, as the part does the whole, and which, though first in order of time, and in this respect preceding the city, is not first in dignity, or in the intention of the Creator. I do not in the least deny (as I have already said), that protection and mutual assistance are amongst the effects demanded of civil society ; but, so far from their being the *sole scope*, it is manifest that man naturally desires the society of his fellow-men, quite apart from these needs, as Aristotle himself observes ; adding that it is none the less true that they are led to unite from the desire of the advantages that accrue therefrom.* And he sums up all with this conclusion, that the perfecting of our being is in the highest degree both our public and our private end (*finis et publicè omnibus et privatim*). It is quite true that along with those advantages there are inconveniences, and no slight ones, which result from the occasional invasion of mutual rights. Liberty, property, and even life itself may be threatened, and society, or rather (to speak more correctly) the authority which

* "Si etiam nihil indigeant (homines), mutuo auxilio, nihilominus affectant vite societatem. Quinetiam communis utilitas conjungit eos, in quantum confert singulis partem bonè vivendi."—*Politic.*, lib. i. cap. ii. p. 4.

governs society, in order to insure to the citizens the perfection of civil life, is bound to be the guardian of its freedom and security, as the Declaration states. To recapitulate in a few words, that I may not be misunderstood, I affirm that men, being bound to accomplish the Creator's designs regarding them, and it being His will that they should together tend to their common good, they are naturally impelled to form the social state. Society thus resulting from the obligation incumbent on men to co-operate to the same end, we hence recognize the source of all their mutual relations, rights, and duties. But without authority no society is possible: accordingly, the end of authority is to unite all the associates in one direction towards their common end, their true good. Authority, then, results from the very nature of things, and from the Creator's will, not from any human contract.

Mar. Armed with Aristotle, our Padre is invulnerable; but I think we are inclined to be a little too philosophical and not practical enough. Let us leave the abstract, and since as the Abbé very truly observed, Rousseau and the *Contrat Social* are quite out of date, let us bid adieu to these theories, and stick to facts. We seem to be agreed at least upon this practical point, that society, or the government which acts in its name, is bound to protect the citizen's rights. I am eager to hear what the Padre has to say upon the right of resistance to oppression. If he denies it, I suspect I can confront him with an authority he will not dispute, viz., the great S. Thomas himself; and if I cannot give chapter and verse, the learned Abbé will come to my rescue.

Abbé. The terms "right of resistance to oppression" are, of course, very vague. They do not state clearly what is the character of this lawful resistance,—whether it be active or simply passive. These points are not defined by the Declaration. The general proposition cannot, therefore, be brought into conflict with Catholic doctrine. S. Thomas, Bellarmine, Suarez, are all agreed upon the natural right of resistance to tyranny, which is, in fact, but a legitimate consequence of the right of self-preservation. S. Thomas says, "Means must be adopted to provide a remedy against the excesses of power if it becomes tyrannical."* And, again, Suarez teaches that "if the king becomes a tyrant by the abuse of his power, to the manifest injury of the community, the people are free to use the natural right of self-defence; of this right it never divests

* "Curandum est si rex tyrannidem diverteret, qualiter posset occurri."
—*De Regimine Principum*, lib. i. c. 6.

itself."* Bellarmine's doctrine is quite in accordance. "Human society," he tells us, "is a perfect republic;" by which he understands that it contains all the elements essential to the natural development of man; it must, therefore, possess the power of self-preservation, which implies the rights of chastising the perturbators of its peace.† Such is the Church's doctrine.

Mar. Strange, indeed, it is that the revolutionists should have more sympathy with Gallicans than with us, whom they stigmatize as Ultramontanes. The Gallicans certainly held that it was unlawful ever to resist the civil authority. If it be Ultramontanism to take our opinions from the doctors and great theologians of the Church of all ages, rather than from the modern Gallican school of 1682, then, indeed, are we Ultramontanes.

Abbé. That no ambiguity on this subject may exist, S. Thomas defines tyrannical government to be such as rules its subjects for its own private advantage, not for the common good; and in this case he judges that the people have the right to dispossess or dethrone the sovereign. The revolutionists differ from us in this,—that they consider that the people have the right to resist and upset the ruling power at their own will and caprice.

Pad. Such was the inevitable result of the promulgation of the natural and imprescriptible right of resistance to oppression. What was this but to cast a brand of sedition and rebellion into the midst of society, and to banish thence all peace and security? See how cautiously the Catholic theologians proceed in stating this delicate question, and that, although in their case it is learned men addressing the learned, who are able to appreciate their meaning, and contrast this with the declaration of the Constitutional Assembly thrown off in times of popular excitement and confusion! The very vagueness of the terms employed adds to the mischievous character of the proposition. It contains, as the Abbé observes, no definition of the right thus guaranteed to men indiscriminately. It never explains what is meant by oppression, or what point that oppression must reach in order to legalize the terrible remedy. This practical question is thus left to the decision of men's passions and prejudices; neither

* "Si rex justam suam potestatem in tyrannidem verteret, illâ in manifestam civitatis perniciem abutendo, posset populus naturali potestate ad se defendendum uti; hac enim nunquam se privavit."—*Defensi Fidei Catholice*, lib. iii. c. iii.

† "Humana societas debet esse perfecta respublica. Ergo debet habere potestatem seipsam conservandi, et proinde puniendi perturbatores pacis."

is a syllable said as to the mode in which this resistance is to be exercised, or what persons are to be the judges of its necessity. The legislators of '93 were more explicit, and propounded "the sacred right of insurrection." Fundamentally, however, there is no difference between '89 and '93 in this matter. Three-quarters of a century have served to prove the worth of this great gift to the people. A vast and systematic system of oppression has been the result of the declaration of imprescriptible right of resistance thereto.

Prof. How do you prove this paradox?

Mar. I was about to enter a certain protest. Our honoured Padre, methinks, often confounds the abuse with the application of a principle. We cannot retrograde, even where we lose in some respects by advance. The simple and unquestioning submission of bygone days tended in many ways to peace and good order, though it must be allowed it often favoured arbitrary power. But the days are past for keeping men in ignorance of their rights. We must teach them now to use them, but we must confess them without reserve.

Pad. No one can attempt to deny the right which man possesses to resist unjust violence. This was certainly no discovery, no acquisition of modern times. It belongs to the instinct of self-preservation, which we see exemplified even in the brute creation. What there is of novelty in the Declaration is the recognized right in each and every citizen, as a man, to resist in every way every oppressive government, or every government which he considers to be oppressive, for who is to be judge of this but himself? Talking of paradoxes, what paradox can be greater than that to which I have alluded,—the making social authority the guardian of the right of resistance to itself? What I have asserted, on the other hand, is no paradox. The same instinct of self-preservation which arms the citizen against oppression arms also social authority in self-defence. The prince who guarantees this right to his subjects, of course takes special precautions against its use; precautions which were not needed before authority was threatened by the publication of anarchical principles. Hence the fear of being overturned as oppressive pushes on governments to become oppressors. To what else do we owe the heavy burdens entailed by the standing armies of continental Europe, which cannot be maintained but by the conscription, than which no institution can be a greater invasion of man's just liberty, or more fruitful in prejudice to morality and the prosperity of the social state? To what else do we owe that system of bureaucracy by which govern-

ments endeavour to get all the threads of administration into their hands, and hence to have at their disposal a second standing army of officials? To what else do we owe the political system of police, which is one of vast "espionage"? When a member of the Parliament of Turin arose and said, "As many of us as are here assembled have all been conspirators," not a dissentient voice was heard. The right of conspiracy is a corollary of that of rebellion, because secrecy alone can secure success. What then? The Government, too, must also turn conspirators. There must be countermeasures to meet the mine; a secret police to detect the secret plotter. When the liberals are not in power, they avail themselves of the right of resistance to upset legitimate governments; when, however, by dint of conspiracy they have obtained possession of the authority, what respect do they pay to this same right? See the measures which the Government of the so-called Italian Kingdom is at this present time adopting against those who, considering themselves as suffering oppression under its rule, consult how to shake it off, or whom it so much as suspects of harbouring such thoughts. Look at the state of the Two Sicilies, where a reckless ferocity of repression is displayed of which no living Italian can recall an example. Who ever heard of men being shot by the hundred, imprisoned, deported far from country and friends; or of women, and even children of twelve years old, being sent to the galleys for having carried a morsel of bread to husbands or fathers; or of venerable ecclesiastics, bishops or cardinals, being consigned to the public prisons in company with malefactors? But I must not allow myself to enlarge on these points: I should have too much to say.

Prof. And all you could say would not affect the principle.

Mar. Of course it cannot be maintained that men have a right to resist authority without due cause, or that authority has the right to use unjust measures for its security, or that usurped authority has any rights at all: these are matters of application.

Pad. The application of the principle is the exponent of its import.

Mar. But pardon me for questioning in some degree the facts on which you ground your argument. It is not fair to charge centralization, bureaucracy, heavy imposts, oppression, &c., altogether on the principles of '89. Methinks Europe had some experience of these vexations previous to that date, and that the "divine right of kings" was as productive of these disagreeable results as the principle of "the right of resistance to oppression."

Pad. The spirit of the revolution was at work long before its outbreak in '89. Regal despotism and democracy, or the sovereignty of the people (for I am not using the word democracy as expressing a mere form of government), are more nearly connected in principle than would be supposed, and practically we see that democracy always tends to absolutism. Both imply an abandonment of the Catholic doctrine concerning sovereign authority. Both substitute rights for duties, and arrogate to themselves what belongs to God. Both are inimical to the Kingship of Christ and to the rights of His Church on earth. Thus we find even pious kings, such as Charles III. of Spain, during the period in question, by a fatal necessity, as it were, employing irreligious and quasi-infidel ministers to carry out their purposes and conduct their government. Not to pursue this subject further, I commend to your consideration the period at which Choiseul, Aranda, Pombal, and Tannucci were ministers at the courts of France, Spain, Portugal, and Naples, and the measures which have rendered the names of these men for ever detestable to all true sons of the Church. When the true doctrine of authority, as I have said, had been unlearned, the mind swayed from one extreme to another by a natural reaction, having lost its just balance and its proper guide. The extremes of error are near neighbours. Despotism and anarchy—anarchy and despotism—mutually produce and provoke each other. In '89 the anarchical principles were formulated.

Abbé. It is with the assertion in the Declaration that we have to deal rather than with its effects. Now general assertions are often ambiguous and susceptible of two interpretations. Those which we have been discussing can be interpreted in a good sense; they also lend themselves to an evil sense.

Pad. The truth they may be held to express becomes a pernicious error by the manner in which it is promulgated. All human authority, however venerable, has its limits, and when perverted to unjust ends may be lawfully resisted. What authority more sacred than the parental? Yet there are cases of abuse when the child may lawfully resist. But who is there that has the interests of morality at heart who, in training children, instead of teaching and enforcing the unqualified command to honour and obey father and mother, would dream of substituting the proposition of the lawfulness of resistance to parental oppression?

Mar. This is true, but we are grown-up children now, and must know everything—often, I must confess, beginning at the wrong end for lack of proper guidance. The Church's office, the great work before her, I apprehend is to educate

the mind of the day, taking it as it is, and bringing religious influence to bear upon it.

Pad. Granted; and one important part of this work is to rectify false judgments and lay down sound principles.

Prof. I confess to being a little mystified. You seem to me to get out of a difficulty by one while admitting, and at another denying, the right of resistance. It comes to this, in fact: you admit it in the abstract, but practically you deny it. Your comparison of the parental authority can avail you little. Society and the State can step in both to judge and interfere when the father exceeds the just limits of his power; but who is to decide when the State itself oppresses? Clearly not the State itself. I know, and may as well anticipate, the reply. You will tell me that the spiritual power is the judge, and you will fall back on the deposing power of the Pope, and hint that its re-acknowledgment is the *sine qua non* of the restoration of a condition of good order and freedom combined. I shall waive all the objections which I should have to make against such a *régime*, were it possible in the present state of things, and content myself with observing that we are speaking of natural rights. If society has the natural right of resistance, who is to be the judge of that right in the natural order? Can a natural right exist without a natural provision for its exercise? Civil society *must* be judge as well as party in this case, unless the theocratic element be admitted. Pray state your views, making abstraction of the panacea which I may presume you would willingly recommend, but which assuredly modern Europe would reject, as considering the remedy worse than the disease.

Pad. My view is that of the doctors of the Church, quoted by our Abbé. So self-evident is the right as I just now stated it, and so strongly suggested is it by men's natural feelings, that they spend few words in proving its lawfulness, but rather address themselves to the prudent restriction of its exercise. With the conditions they lay down, I accept it. Resistance is lawful:—1. When a government has become substantially and habitually tyrannical, and that is when it has lost sight of the common good, and pursues its own selfish objects to the manifest detriment of its subjects, especially where their religious interests are concerned. 2. When all legal and pacific means have been tried in vain to recall the ruler to a sense of his duty. 3. When there is a reasonable probability that resistance will be successful, and not entail greater evils than it seeks to remove. 4. When the judgment formed as to the badness of the government, and the prudence of resistance thereto, is not the opinion only of private persons or of a mere party; but is

that of the larger and better portion of the people, so that it may morally be considered as the judgment of the community as a whole. In that case resistance is not to be considered as rebellion to a constituted authority, for such resistance is never lawful. But how few will such cases be! If malcontents went to consult the Catholic doctors, revolutions would indeed be rare. But the turbulent unfortunately consult the principles of '89, which, having largely and unrestrictedly accorded the "right of resistance," have (so to say) on the other hand created a moral necessity for despotic rule. The sovereign who knows he can and may, at any moment, be dethroned, becomes suspicious, and suspicion leads directly to oppression and to tyranny. So true is the profound saying of Bossuet, to whom Providence had not however given the practical lessons it has to us, that by the way of Christian obedience we take the straight road to liberty; and that by that of unbelieving independence we run direct to slavery.

Abbé. The right of resistance resides, in fact, in the body of the nation, not in individuals. Its exercise must be determined by the laws of natural justice, and by the conditions of the political constitution. I believe we shall all agree so far, leaving aside altogether the further practical questions springing from the general proposition.

Mar. Before we leave this subject I notice that our Padre just now spoke of "continental Europe," evidently excepting England, as was just. His observations with regard to bureaucracy, political espionage, the conscription, &c., were plainly not applicable to that country. How do you account, reverend Father, may I ask, for this exceptional felicity of Protestant Britain in modern times? Nowhere are the principles of political freedom more strongly maintained, or more fully acted upon, while nowhere is the law more respected; nowhere is Government, whose measures are freely discussed and opposed, seated on a firmer basis.

Pad. The exception may be said to prove the rule. The principles of '89 are, in England, virtually repudiated by its traditions, by its history, by its manners, by its laws. It has never swept away, as we have seen France do, its political and social heritage. The basis of its free constitution was laid in Catholic times, and has been retained, notwithstanding the national alienation from the Church. Again, France was able to carry her revolutionary banner at the head of her legions and sow her principles broadcast over Europe; but England occupied a hostile position during the triumph of the first revolution, which tended, of course, to strengthen her opposition to the new doctrines of her Gallican neighbours. To this day,

notwithstanding that reprehensible policy by which the Government of that country fans the spirit of revolt in foreign lands, and this mainly from its anti-Catholic sympathies with the revolutionists, and from its hatred of the Papacy, and in despite of many large concessions in the direction of democracy, England has not adopted the principles of '89. But, to return to the proposition under discussion. I conceive that it is intimately connected with the question of the origin of authority. It is to erroneous views upon this subject that, I am convinced, we must refer the ideas which I have been combating with respect to the right of resistance.

Mar. This leads us at once to the consideration of Art. III. of the Declaration,—“The principle of all sovereignty resides essentially in the nation.” For my part, I accept this proposition. The divine authority of kings was an invention of the 17th century. Gallicanism makes as large inroads on the Church's just authority, as the Padre but now observed, as on the liberty of the people. It was, as he truly said, a departure from the old doctrine of the Church and that of her most esteemed theologians. As usual, I must refer to my friend the Abbé for chapter and verse.

Abbé. I cannot stand by you without explanation or exception. If by principle is meant the original source of sovereignty, clearly it is to be sought neither in the nation nor in the prince, but in God.

Pad. Either the legislators of '89 did not understand the sense of the words principle and essence, or such was their meaning. The principle or essence of any thing is that by which it is what it is. The proposition could only, therefore, be true if the essence of the nation, and consequently the principle of sovereignty, which has its root therein, was self-constituted. But man neither made himself, nor made himself what he is, a civil animal (*civile animal*); he is such by nature, that is, such as God made him. In God, therefore, who has made man naturally social by rendering society, which cannot exist without authority, essential to him, must reside the principle of sovereignty. Understood, then, in its obvious sense, the proposition is false and impious.

Mar. But we need not so understand it. Why insist on so rigidly philosophical a sense of the words “principle” and “essentially?” We often use these terms in a more general and popular sense. In God, of course, as the Creator, is the source of all power, as of every other faculty which He communicates to the creature. When we speak of the principle of sovereignty residing essentially in the nation, we mean, that power comes from the people, not immediately, but mediately. As authority rules for the general

good, not for its own individual interests, so it rules by the general consent, not by its own inherent and essential right.

Prof. I am quite sure that I do not agree with our thorough-going Padre, but I should like to know how far you and I and the Abbé are at one. You, Marquis, grant that power comes mediately from the people. Do you mean that the community has simply the power of designating the individual who is to exercise the authority? or do you hold that the community actually confers the power which the ruler henceforth exercises?

Mar. I hold that the community confers the power: the people are the channel by which it is conveyed. Else how could it be lawful to put constitutional restraints upon the sovereign authority, to limit it or to render it responsible? What the people can retain or confer, the people must possess.

Abbé. Power does not so originate with the community as that, previously to the choice of a ruler, it is free to be or not be governed. To suppose this would be to fall back on the *Contrat Social*. Government in itself is no more a pact than is society; but the conditions under which it is exercised have been left by the Sovereign of all to the will and disposal of man. It has therefore both a human and divine origin. Sovereignty resides in the community in this sense, that, apart from all designation by the common consent, no man in himself, and by his own inherent right, possesses it. It resides in the "mystical body" formed by the collection of individuals united in society. Such, in brief, is Suarez's doctrine, and S. Thomas's, as quoted by him.* Not even Adam, according to that great theologian, possessed an inherent sovereignty. His power, as paternal, was but economic. Political power did not commence till, by the existence of several families, a perfect community was formed.

Pad. I conceive that some confusion exists in men's minds as to the limitation of power such as we see in constitutional governments, and such as the community, in the rare cases where it is called upon to elect its ruler, can impose to any amount or in any degree. These limitations, when examined, are always simply a division of the power amongst several hands. Government may be either a so-called absolute monarchy (though, strictly speaking, no Christian government is or can be absolute), or it may be a constitutional monarchy, where different bodies have a share of the power exercised through their representatives; or it may assume the republican

* "Dicendum ergo hanc potestatem ex solâ rei naturâ in nullo singulari homine existere, sed in hominum collectione. Conclusio est communis, et certa sumitur ex divo Thoma."—Suarez, *De Legibus*, lib. iii. c. ii., n. 3, 4.

form, more or less aristocratic or democratic in character, which then becomes what we may call a polyarchy. But observe, the supreme power is always supreme wherever it resides, or to whatever number of hands it is committed. Unity of action is a condition of sovereignty, and where this is lacking anarchy ensues. After premising so much to clear the way, I must observe that I dislike arguing in the air, and without a full and clear comprehension of our basis. What is to be understood by sovereignty residing essentially in a community?—this is the point. I will illustrate my meaning by an example drawn from a society of purely human institution. A hundred persons put into a common fund, say, 1,000 francs each, and set up some industrial or commercial business. Here, no doubt, the principle of authority essentially resides in the society itself. Why so? Evidently because its very reason of existence is in itself and in the will of its members, without which will it would not have been so much as thought of. But there could be no parallel between such a society and human society in general, unless the latter also depended for its existence on the will of its members; and in fact the framers of the Principles of '89 did admit this preposterous hypothesis, which has resulted in consequences sufficient to demonstrate practically the falseness of the principle assumed, to those who would have been unable perhaps to detect it *a priori*. It is quite intelligible how the hundred associates, whose power extends over affairs, not persons, should all partake in the sovereignty, and administer it in common, or delegate their authority to an official of their own choice, who simply represents and exercises their power, and whom at their pleasure they can displace, just as they appointed him. But in civil society the sovereignty regards persons, not things; it implies one who commands and others who obey. Now if sovereignty resided essentially in the nation, as in this supposed industrial community, so that it was the sole and true sovereign, where would be the subjects over whom it would rule? And pray, what sort of sovereignty is that which the possessor can never personally exercise, nay, which becomes all the more impossible for him to exercise in proportion as society becomes more perfectly organized?

Prof. Differing most widely as we do, I must say, with all respect to my other two esteemed friends, that I would rather argue with our Padre than with either of them. I am inclined to say with Goliath, "Give me a man, that we may fight together." Our good Abbé entrenches himself in his immobility, and will see in a proposition only just what he can make to square with his own doctrine.

Abbé. With that of the doctors of the Church, by your favour.

Prof. Well, be it so; and as for the Marquis, who gallantly takes up the banner of progress, and caracoles by my side for part of the way, I know he is sure at last, by an unhappy inconsistency, to sacrifice his theory, and side in fact with the other two.

Pad. By a happy inconsistency.

Prof. Of course, you would say so. I am at downright variance, I know, with all of you, and so are the "Principles;" and you alone admit this fully: thus if agreement is not the more likely, argument is at least less perplexing. We understand each other's position. Sovereignty, you maintain, does not reside in the nation: if it did, sovereign and subject would be identical. Moreover, you affirm that the sovereignty cannot belong to him who cannot possibly exercise it save through a delegate. I deny the force of both conclusions. Sovereign and subject in this case are the same. Man sees that rule is needed for the purposes of order; he appoints his ruler; he is therefore in a sense self-ruled. This is the very idea of modern political society. Men obey the laws which they combine to frame and sanction. It is true that this sovereignty, as belonging to a multitude, can be exercised only in their collective capacity, and by delegates; but it is none the less so exercised. This point is secured by the representative system and a responsible government.

Pad. And thus, the nation still retaining the right of superintending, correcting, and even revoking, the acts of its delegate,—nay, as an evident consequence, of withdrawing from him the power with which it had entrusted him,—it follows that he who exercises the sovereign power is, in fact, the only subject.

Abbé. Although holding that power is derived from the people, I do not grant that they have therefore the power of withdrawing it at pleasure. Power in the abstract is from God; and when once the power has been conferred in the concrete upon an individual, he becomes the representative of God and of His justice, and the natural law commands obedience. I am not quite sure whether the Padre holds that the people only possess the power of designating their ruler, or whether he allows that they are also the channel by which power is conferred.

Pad. Sovereignty essentially resides in God: "*Per me Reges regnant*,"—"by Me kings reign,"—not by the people. *Dei minister est in bonum*, the ruler is "God's minister for good,"

not the people's delegate. As respects, however, the form of exercising this sovereignty, and the persons invested with it, all has been left to human institution, guided by the laws of justice; but I would observe that popular choice or election is only accidentally and rarely the mode in which the sovereign is designated. When such a case occurs, and it does occur sometimes necessarily, the people can legitimately, not only choose their monarch, but even stipulate conditions; and this constitutes a political, not a social, compact. But note, even in this case the people do not give an authority which they neither have nor can have; they simply designate the person or persons who are to exercise it. As I observed, constitutional limitations are not limitations of sovereign power—a contradiction in the very terms,—but a division of it amongst several hands or bodies, for whose united action the constitution provides, or ought to provide if the purposes of government are to be carried out.

Abbé. But it seems to me that the theologians to whom I referred concede something more to the people than the power of designation. In practical conclusions we thoroughly coincide; our difference, if differ we really do, regards the theory. These theologians have expressly taught that God, even as He made man by the act of creation sociable, so also He deposited in the community supreme civil power, not by a special institution, but by the same act of creation.* Sovereignty accordingly is a natural right of the nation, and, like other natural rights, of divine origin. To say, therefore, that the community only designates the sovereign, but does not confer the power, appears to me opposed to the opinions of the best Catholic authorities. Suarez, for instance, expressly refutes this notion, which has been devised in order to obviate the danger of what I deprecate as much as yourself, viz., the idea that the people, in as much as they confer the power, are superior to the ruler on whom they confer it. Suarez, then, alleges in proof of the doctrine he lays down, a reason which the Marquis has already given. After stating that the individual when once invested with sovereignty becomes God's representative, he adds, "But that the power should be possessed by such a man, is from the gift of the community itself, as is plain: in this point of view, therefore, power is of human

* "Suprema potestas civilis, per se spectata, immediatè quidem data est a Deo hominibus in civitatem seu perfectam communitatem politicam congregatis—non quidem ex peculiari et quasi positivâ institutione vel donatione omnino distinctâ a productione talis naturæ, sed per naturalem consecutionem ex vi primæ creationis ejus."—Suarez, *Defensio Fidei*, lib. iii.

right; moreover, that the Government of such a republic or province should be monarchical is of human institution: *ergo*,—the principedom itself is of man. What serves to prove this, is that, according to the pact or convention between the kingdom and the king, the power of the king is greater or less; *ergo*, simply speaking, "it is of men."* It is clear that Suarez says that the power is conferred, not merely the sovereign designated.

Pad. It is quite true that Suarez and other scholastics use these and similar words; and previously to examination, they may be open to misunderstanding in these days, when erroneous doctrines of the sovereignty of the people are rife in the world; but if you look closely at them you will perceive that they assert no more than what I myself maintain, namely, that in the community, abstracting from all facts of existing institutions and a constituted government—for it is in this light alone that the scholastics are considering the matter—the right to designate the persons to whom the authority is to be committed, and to choose the form of government—all, in short, which belongs to the domain of facts connected therewith,—appertains to the community. In this sense the community confers the sovereign power, that is, the title to exercise sovereign power; but it does not confer the power itself, in the sense I have already stated. It has it not to give. The people is not itself sovereign, and cannot make a sovereign, for this simple reason, that it cannot communicate what it has not. Power is of God. The very reason which Suarez assigns, and which indeed the Marquis previously alleged, as well as the other terms he employs, sufficiently demonstrate this point; for, in proof that to the community belongs the original right of choosing the sovereign and the form of sovereignty, he says that, according to the pact or convention is the king's power greater or less; in other words, less or more share of governmental authority is committed to him. Plainly, he could not mean that the community imparted a greater or less degree of supreme power to government itself—a self-contradiction in terms, as I already observed, since supreme power cannot be greater or less—reserving to itself the remainder, as it were. From the very nature of the subject it is evident

* "Tamen (potestatem) esse in hoc homine, est ex donatione ipsius reipublicæ; ergo sub ea ratione est de jure humano; item quod regimen talis reipublicæ vel provinciæ sit monarchicum, est ex hominum institutione: ergo et principatus ipse est ab hominibus. Cujus etiam signum est quia, juxta pactum vel conventionem factam inter regnum et regem, ejus potestas major vel minor existit; ergo est ab hominibus, simpliciter loquendo."—*De Legibus*, lib. iii. c. 4.

that it is of power in the concrete, viz., as exercised by this or that individual, that he is treating, which resolves itself into what I stated, that apart from all the circumstances which belong to concrete existence, and taken in its simple essential constitution, a case seldom realized, society possesses the right of conferring the sovereignty on whom and in what form it pleases. But this which S. Thomas and the scholastics teach, is very far from an admission that the principle of sovereignty resides in the nation; and amounts to no more (in my opinion at least) than to the assertion that when no determined government or lawful ruler exists, it belongs to the community to confer the right or title to exercise power, which may be, and is often, called the power itself.

Mar. These, after all, are metaphysical subtleties. I confess myself unable to grasp the difference between conferring power and conferring the right to exercise it.

Prof. The real practical question, of course, is whether the ruler is the nation's delegate or God's representative. Does the nation so strip itself of its right of conferring the power or the title to exercise power—I care not which, it comes to the same thing practically—as to possess no longer any claim to control the ruling power? Does the king become responsible to God alone? or can he lawfully be called to account by society? The Abbé holds that the nation parts with its power as soon as it has conferred it; that it possesses it only to give it away. The Padre holds that it never possessed it to give, and can only designate the ruler to create institutions. The Marquis holds that the people is the channel by which power is conferred; but does he hold that the authority is responsible to the people?

Mar. The laws of constitutional government bind the authority as well as the subjects. I consider, therefore, that government is responsible to the public when it transgresses these laws. Moreover, even in despotic or unconstitutional governments, when the ruler acts in a manner subversive of the principles of order, for the maintenance of which political society exists, he is responsible to his subjects according to the laws of natural justice.

Pad. Or rather government, as the instrument of order, ceases as it were to exist. In constitutional governments, where laws bind the king, this is explicable, not by his responsibility to the sovereign people, but by his own obligations according to the political pact.

Mar. I am willing to accept this view theoretically, but practically he is responsible to the nation. M. le Professeur has accused me of taking up the banner of progress, and

deserting my colours whenever we come to action. We are friends here, and nothing offensive was intended, I know; but it is a serious attack, if not on my sincerity, at least on my intellectual consistency. Now I beg to assert, and am ready to prove in act, that there is no greater friend to political freedom than myself. Repudiating all abuse made of the principles of liberty, ill-understood or hypocritically paraded by bad or designing men, I believe that the doctrine of popular sovereignty is a sound one, and representative government its proper exponent and the safeguard of freedom. I am also ready to accept all the consequences of governmental responsibility. I do not believe that anarchical consequences or despotic results must necessarily ensue from the acceptance of these doctrines. Far from it. When men are taught to understand the true meaning and dignity of self-government, they will the better respect the authority which emanates from their own will. Moreover, I believe that personal freedom and municipal liberties are not sufficient to nurse in men's souls the exalted virtue of patriotism. For the manly civic virtues we must have political liberty. Truly to love their country, all must feel that they have not an interest only, but personally a direct influence in the management of its affairs.

Pad. The Marquis, in his enthusiasm, gallops over so much ground, and makes such wide digressions from the immediate subject, that it becomes impossible at this late hour to follow him. Besides, the discussion of some of these points would more naturally belong to the consideration of the sixth article of the Declaration, where it is affirmed that "the law is the expression of the general will, and that all citizens have a right to concur, personally or through their representatives, in its enactment." This subject connects itself naturally with the latter clause of the third article, which asserts that "no body or individual can exercise authority which does not expressly emanate from the nation,"—a proposition which might be understood in a good sense and raise no objection, but for the term "*expressly*," concerning which I should have decided exceptions to make. I cannot, however, close this meeting without entering my protest against the two assertions which the Marquis has just made. Valuing liberty as much as himself or the Professor, and believing that representative government is one amongst other forms of government by which it may be secured, I cannot admit that no liberty can exist apart from this system. Nay, more; I hold that tyranny is quite compatible with its fullest development. There are people to whom it is suited, and others again to

whom it is very unsuitable, and to whose national character it is uncongenial. Other circumstances connected with the previous development of local institutions will cause it, where imposed empirically and not springing out of its natural antecedents, grossly to fail of its proposed object. Neither can I grant that no true patriotism can flourish (I use the term as I can alone accept it, in its Christian sense) unless each man feels that he has his personal share of political power and a hand in conducting the government of his country.

ART. II.—RECENT IRISH POETRY.

Lays of the Western Gael and other Poems. By SAMUEL FERGUSON. London: Bell & Daldy. 1865.

Poems. By SPERANZA (LADY WILDE). Dublin: Duffy. 1864.

Laurence Bloomfield in Ireland. A modern Poem. By WILLIAM ALLINGHAM. London: Macmillan & Co. 1864.

Inisfail, a Lyrical Chronicle of Ireland. By AUBREY DE VERE. Dublin: Duffy. 1864.

IN the palmy days of Young Ireland, its writers and speakers were particularly prone to the quotation of that strange saying of Fletcher of Saltoun—"If a man were permitted to make all the Ballads, he need not care who should make the Laws of a country." It has been the destiny of Young Ireland to make and to administer the laws of other countries than that for which its hot youth hoped to legislate. But it has certainly left Ireland a legacy of excellent ballads. A glance at the fortunes of some of the more prominent members of this brilliant but ill-fated party, as they present themselves to view at this moment, suggests curious contrasts and strange reflections. Mr. Gavan Duffy, who was assuredly the source of its noblest and wisest inspirations, after having within ten years occupied high office in three Victorian Ministries, and laid the impress of his organizing genius deep on the constitutional foundations of that most rising of the Australian States,—is on his way home from Melbourne for a brief European vacation. Mr. John Mitchel, who represented the more violent and revolutionary section of Young Ireland, was, before the American war commenced, editor of the *Richmond Inquirer*, one of the most extreme organs of secession; and afterwards visited Paris with the hope of inducing the Emperor Napoleon to invade Ireland: but since the war was declared, he has resumed his post at Richmond—sometimes writing articles that are

supposed more particularly to forecast President Davis's policy ; sometimes serving in the ranks of General Lee's army as the driver of an ambulance waggon. His eldest son fired the first shot that struck Fort Sumter, and afterwards was himself struck at the heart in its command by a northern bullet. Mitchel's favourite lieutenant, Devin Reilly, on the other hand, died in office at Washington, and his illness was attributed at the time to over-fatigue in one of the earliest of those great electioneering contests, in which the supremacy of Mr. Lincoln finally came to be established over Mr. Stephen Douglas, "the little giant of the west," and the only man, in Mr. Reilly's ardent conviction, who could have saved the American Union. Mr. D'Arcy McGee, whose character bore to that of Devin Reilly about the same relation as Mr. Duffy's did to that of Mr. Mitchel, is at present a leading member of the Executive Council of Canada, and (the Duke of Newcastle was of opinion) the ablest statesman of British America ; in proof of which it may suffice to say, that the project of the Canadian Confederation was in a great degree originated and elaborated by him. The handsome young orator, whose fiery eloquence surpassed in its influence on an Irish audience in the Rotunda even the most brilliant effects of Sheil at the old Catholic Association, is now to be recognized in a bronzed and war-worn soldier, under the style and title of Major-General Thomas Francis Meagher, of the United States' army, commanding a division, which, after Sherman commenced his marvellous march on Savannah, was sent forward to hold the southern section of Tennessee, and was last heard of in camp at Chattanooga. One of this orator's favourite disciples, Eugene O'Reilly, holds an equivalent rank ; but his line of service has lain not in America, but in Asia—his allegiance is not to the President Abraham Lincoln, but to the Sultan Abdul Aziz ; he is known to all true believers under the style of O'Reilly Bey, one of the earliest of the Christian officers who took rank under the Hatti Hamayoun ; and his sword's avenging justice was freely felt among the Mahometan mob, who horrified Christendom five years ago by the massacres of Syria. What region of the earth is not full of the labours of this party, sect, and school of all the Irish talents, of whom may well be sung the antique Milesian elegy, to which their prophet and guide gave words that complain "they have left but few heirs of their company ?"* The rabid violence and

* *As truagh gan oidir 'n-a bh-farradh*—literally, "What a pity that there is no heir of their company." See the "Lament for the Milesians," in *The Poems of Thomas Davis*. Dublin : Duffy.

the underbred vulgarity of style which belong to so many of the Irish Nationalist party of the present day, are all unlike even the errors of Young Ireland. That party, though it tragically failed in fulfilling its hopes at home, has at all events justified its ambition abroad; and it was always and everywhere singularly true to its ideas. Scattered as it is, broken, and often apparently divided against itself, its members have not failed to yield loyal, valiant, and signal service to whatever cause they espoused or country they adopted. Its poets have had a principal hand in framing the constitutions of states manifestly destined to future greatness. Its orators have led forlorn hopes against fearful odds; and, whether in the marshes of the Chickahominy or in Syrian defiles, have not known how to show their backs to the enemy. It would be easy to trace over a far wider range the fortunes of its members since the great emigration that scattered them in the years that followed their catastrophe in '48. It is possible any day to find a Young Irelander, who at a more or less brief period after Ballingarry *abijt, evasit, erupit*, in the red baggy breeches of the Zouave, or in judicial crimson and ermine at the Antipodes; in the black robe of a Passionist Father, or the silk gown of a Queen's Counsel; surveying a railroad in Dakotah, or organizing brigands in Sicily; helping in some subordinate way the Emperor Maximilian to found the Mexican Empire, or on the high road to make himself a Yellow Button at Pekin. As for American generals North and South, and Colonial law-givers east and west, their names are legion—and the legion's name very much begins with Mac or O'. May they make war and law to good advantage! It was not given to them to make either for Ireland; but, if Fletcher of Saltoun was a wise man in his generation, they in theirs have left their country a far more precious heritage.

Irish poetry certainly existed before Young Ireland, and was even considered, like oratory, to be a quality naturally and easily indigenous to the Irish genius. Moore had not unworthily sustained the reputation of his country in an age of great poets; and it was Moore's own avowed belief that his "Irish Melodies" were the very flowering of his inspiration, and were indeed alone warranted to preserve his fame to future ages. But neither Moore, nor any other poet of Irish birth, had attempted to give to the Irish that poetry "racy of the soil," wherein every image and syllable smacks of their own native nationality, which Burns and Scott, and a host of minor poets, had created for the Scotch. This is the work which Young Ireland deliberately and avowedly attempted, and in which it has assuredly succeeded. When the effort

was first made, it is told that several of the writers who afterwards wrote what, in its order of Ballad Poetry, is unexcelled in the language—and notably Mr. Davis—were quite unaware of any possession of the poetic faculty, and took to the task as a boy takes to his tale of Latin Spondees and Dactyls at College. But the stream was in the rock, and when the rock was tapped the stream flowed. In the course of less than a year "*The Spirit of the Nation*" was published, in which, with much undeniable rubbish, there appeared a number of ballads and songs that won the admiration of all good critics; and to which the far more important testimony of their popular acceptance is still given in the form of continuously recurring and increasing editions. A Scotch publisher—Mr. Griffin, of Glasgow—ten years ago had heard such accounts of this curious flood-tide of Irish verse that he thought it might be a safe speculation to try whether, despite its politics, it might not make its way in the British market. The edition was very soon exhausted, and the book is now, we believe, out of print. These facts are of even more value than the high opinion which so experienced and accomplished a critic as Lord Jeffrey expressed about the same time of the poetic gifts of Davis and Duffy; for by universal consent the test of sale loses all its vulgarity when applied to that most ethereal compound of the human intellect, poetry. The poet is born, and not made, according to Horace; but in so far as he is made anything by man, it is by process of universal suffrage over the counter. Gradual, growing, general recognition, testified by many editions, at last, in the course of thirty years, establishes the irrefragable position of a Tennyson; against which a Tupper, long struggling, in the end finds his level, and lines trunks.

Much of the poetry of this time was, consciously or unconsciously, mimetic—mainly, of Sir Walter Scott and of Lord Macaulay, whose "*Lays of Ancient Rome*" had recently been published. Scott, indeed, more distinctly suggested the elements out of which the Young Ireland poetry grew. Burns wrote in a peculiar provincial dialect, and with the exception of a few glorious lyrics, which will occur to every reader's recollection, he wrote for a district and for a class. But in Scott's mind all the elements of the Scottish nationality were equally confluent and homogeneous—the Highlander, the Lowlander, and the Islander; the Celt, the Saxon, and the Dane; the Laird, the Presbyterian, and the Peasant; and his imagination equally vivified all times—from those of the Varangians at Constantinople to those of the Jacobites at Culloden. But in Ireland there was no formed dialect like

the Lowland Scotch, with a settled vocabulary and a concrete form. The language of the peasantry in many parts of the country was the same sort of base English that a foreigner speaks—scanty in its range of words, ill-articulated and aspirated, loose in the use of the liquid letters, formed according to alien idioms, and flavoured with alien expletives. The language of the best of the ballads of the peasantry was that of a period in which the people still thought in Irish, and expressed themselves in broken English, uttered with the deep and somewhat guttural tones of the Celt, and garnished now and then with the more racy epithets, or endearments, or shibboleths of their native speech. For a time the example of Lord Macaulay's ballad poetry prevailed, with its long rolling metre, its picturesque nomenclature, its contrasts rather rhetorical than poetical. It was possible to describe that decisive charge of the Irish Brigade at Fontenoy, which Mr. Carlyle treats as a mere myth, in strains which instantly suggest those of the "Battle of Ivry." And so did Davis in a very memorable ballad; but the likeness was mainly in the measure, and Lord Macaulay had no copyright in lines of fourteen feet. The poem itself was Irish to the manner born; and, it might be pleaded, was only as like the verse of Lord Macaulay, as the prose of Lord Macaulay is like the prose of Edmund Burke. Beyond this task-work, however, which, although very ingeniously and fluently done, was still as much task-work as college themes, there arose a difficulty and a hope. Was it possible to transfuse the peculiar spirit of the Irish native poetry into the English tongue? The researches of the Archæological Society were at this time rapidly disintombing the long-hidden historical and poetical treasures of the Irish language. Many of these had been translated by Clarence Mangan, in a style which did not pretend to be literally faithful, but which so expanded, illustrated, and harmonized the original that the poem, while losing none of its idiosyncrasy, gained in every quality of grace, freedom, and force. The rich, the sometimes redundant array of epithets, the mobile passionate transitions, the tender and melancholy spirit of veneration for a vanishing civilization, for perishing houses, scattering clans, and a persecuted Church—some even of the more graceful of the idioms and more musical of the metres—might surely be naturalized in the English language; and so an Irish poetical dialect be absolutely invented in the middle of the nineteenth century. It was known how an Irish peasant spoke broken English, and put it into rhyme that did not want a strange wild melody, that was to more finished and scholarly verse as the flavour of *poteen* is to the

flavour of Burgundy. But how would an Irish bard, drawing his inspiration from the primeval Ossianic sources, and thinking in the true ecstatic spirit of the Irish muse, speak, if he were condemned to speak, in the speech of the Saxon? This was the bold conception; and no one who is familiar with the poetry of Ireland during the last twenty years will deny that it has been in great part fulfilled.

The poet to whom its execution is especially due can hardly be called a Young Irelander in the political sense of the word. But Young Ireland was a literary school as well as a political sect; and any one who remembers, or may read, Mr. Ferguson's wonderful "*Lament for Thomas Davis*," which it is to be greatly regretted he has not included in the present edition of his poems, will recognise the strong elective affinities which attached him to their action and influence. As it is, this volume is by far the most remarkable recent contribution of the Irish poetical genius to English literature. Mr. Ferguson has accomplished the problem of conveying the absolute spirit of Irish poetry into English verse, and he has done so under the most difficult conceivable conditions—for he prefers a certain simple and unluxuriant structure in the plan of his poems, and he uses in their composition the most strictly Saxon words he can find. But all the accessories and figures, and still more a certain weird melody in the rhythm, that reminds the ear of the wild grace of the native music, indicate at every turn what Mr. Froude has half-reproachfully called "the subtle spell of the Irish mind." It is not surprising to find even careful and accomplished English critics unable to reach to the essential meaning of this poetry, which to many evidently appears as bald as the style of Burns first seemed to Southron eyes, when he became the fashion at Edinburgh eighty years ago. And yet to master the dialect of Burns is at least as difficult as to master the dialect of Chaucer, while Mr. Ferguson rarely uses a word that would not be passed by Swift or Defoe. Before one of the most beautiful, simple, and graceful of his later poems, a recent critic paused, evidently dismayed by the introduction, of which, however, not willing to dispute the beauty, he quoted a few lines. It was an old Irish legend, versified with surpassing grace and spirit, of which this is the argument. Fergus MacRoy, King of Ulster in the old Pagan times, was a very good king of his kind. He loved his people and they loved him. He was handsome, and strong, and tall. He bore himself well in war and in the chase. He drank with discretion. Nevertheless his life had two troubles. He did not love the law; and he did love a widow. To listen as Chief Justiciary to the causes, of which a constant crop sprang

up at Emania, tares and corn thickly set together, troubled him sorely. To make verses to the widow on the other hand, came as easy as sipping usquebaugh or metheglin. He proposed, and though a king was refused; but not discouraged, pressed his suit again and again. And at last Nessa the fair yielded, but she made a condition that her son Conor should sit on the judgment-seat daily by his stepfather's side. This easily agreed, Nessa became Queen, while, as Fergus tells the tale :

While in council and debate
Conor daily by me sate ;
Modest was his mien in sooth,
Beautiful the studious youth,

Questioning with eager gaze,
All the reasons and the ways
In the which, and why because
Kings administer the laws.

In this wise a year passed, the youth diligently observant, with faculties ripening and brightening as his Majesty's grew more consciously rusty and slow ; and then a crisis came, which Mr. Ferguson describes in verses of which it is hard to say whether they best deserve the coif or the laurel, for in every line there is the sharp wit of the lawyer as well as the vivid fancy of the poet :—

Till upon a day in Court
Rose a plea of weightier sort,
Tangled as a briary thicket
Were the rights and wrongs intricate

Which the litigants disputed,
Challenged, mooted, and confuted,
Till when all the plea was ended
Nought at all I comprehended.

Scorning an affected show
Of the thing I did not know,
Yet my own defect to hide,
I said, " Boy judge, thou decide."

Conor with unalter'd mien,
In a clear sweet voice serene,
Took in hand the tangled skein,
And began to make it plain.

As a sheep-dog sorts his cattle,
As a king arrays his battle,
So the facts on either side
He did marshal and divide.

Every branching side-dispute
Traced he downward to the root
Of the strife's main stem, and there
Laid the ground of difference bare.

Then to scope of either cause,
Set the compass of the laws,
This adopting, that rejecting,—
Reasons to a head collecting,—

As a charging cohort goes
Through and over scatter'd foes,
So, from point to point, he brought
Onward still the weight of thought

Through all error and confusion,
Till he set the clear conclusion
Standing like a king alone,
All things adverse overthrown,

And gave judgment clear and sound :—
Praises filled the hall around ;
Yea, the man that lost the cause
Hardly could withhold applause.

In these exquisite verses, the language is as strict to the point as if it were taken from Mr. Smith's "*Action at Law*;" but the reader will remark how every figure reminds him, and yet not in any mere mimetic fashion, of the spirit and illustrations of the Ossianic poetry. Nevertheless each word taken by itself is simple Saxon. Its Celtic character only runs like a vein through the poem, but it colours and saturates it through and through.

The greatest of Mr. Ferguson's poems, however, is undoubtedly "*the Welshmen of Tirawley*," a ballad which we do not fear to say, is unsurpassed in the English language, or perhaps in even the Spanish. Its epic proportion and integrity, the vivid picturesqueness of its phraseology, its wild and original metre, its extraordinary realisation of the laws and customs of an Irish clan's daily life, the stern brevity of its general narrative, and the richness of its figures, though all barbaric pearl and gold, give it a pre-eminent place among ballads. Scott would have devoted three volumes to the story, were it not for the difficulty of telling some of its incidents. Mr. Ferguson exhibits no little skill in the way that he hurries his readers past what he could not altogether omit. For the facts upon which the ballad is founded are simply horrible, and they are historically true.

After the time of Strongbow, several Welsh families who

had followed his flag settled in Connaught. Among these "kindly Britons" of Tirawley, were the Walshes or Wallises, the Heils (*a quibus* MacHale, and, possibly, that most perfect instance of the *Hibernis ipsis Hibernior*, the Archbishop of Tuam); also the Lynotts and the Barretts, with whom we are at present more particularly concerned. These last claimed descent from the High Steward of the Manor of Camelot, and their end is a story fit for the Round Table. The great toparch of the territory was the MacWilliam Burke, as the Irish called the head of the de Burgos, descended from William FitzAdelm de Burgo, conqueror of Connaught, and therein commonly called William Conquer—of whom the Marquis of Clanricarde is the present lineal representative; being to Connaught even still somewhat as the MacCallummore is to Argyle, more especially when he happens to be in the Cabinet, and to have the patronage of the Post-office. Now the Lynotts were subject to the Barretts, and the Barretts were subject to the Burkes. But when the Barretts' bailiff, Scorna Boy, came to collect the Lynotts' taxes, he so demeaned himself that the whole clan rose as one man, even as Jack Cade, and slew him. Whereupon the vengeful Barretts gave to all mankind among the Lynott clan, a terrible choice—of which one alternative was blindness; and the bearded men were all of their own preference blinded, and led to the river Duvowen, and told to walk over the stepping stones of Clochan-na-n'all; and they all stumbled into the flood and were drowned, except old Emon Lynott, of Garranard—whom accordingly the Barretts brought back and blinded over again, by running needles through his eyeballs.

But with prompt-projected footsteps, sure as ever,
Emon Lynott again crossed the river,
Though Duvowen was rising fast,
And the shaking stones o'ercast,
By cold floods boiling past;
Yet you never,
Emon Lynott,
Faltered once before your foemen of Tirawley.

But turning on Ballintubber bank, you stood,
And the Barretts thus bespoke o'er the flood—
"Oh, ye foolish sons of Wattin,
Small amends are these you've gotten,
For, while Scorna Boy lies rotten,
I am good
For vengeance!"
Sing the vengeance of the Welshmen of Tirawley.

For 'tis neither in eye nor eyesight that a man
Bears the fortunes of himself and his clan,
But in the manly mind
These darken'd orbs behind,
That your needles could never find,
Through they ran
Through my heartstrings.
Sing the vengeance of the Welshmen of Tirawley.

But little your women's needles do I reckon,
For the night from Heaven never fell so black,
But Tirawley and abroad
From the Moy to Cuan-an-fod,
I could walk it, every sod,
Path and track,
Ford and togher,
Seeking vengeance on you, Barretts of Tirawley !

And so leaving "loud-shriek-echoing Garranard," the
Lynott, with his wife and seven children, abandons his
home, and takes refuge in Glen Nephin, where, in the course
of a year, a son is born to him, whom he dedicates from
the first breath to his vengeance. He trains this boy with
assiduous care to all the accomplishments of a Celtic
cavalier.

And, as ever the bright boy grew in strength and size,
Made him perfect in each manly exercise,
The salmon in the flood,
The dun deer in the wood,
The eagle in the cloud,
To surprise,
On Ben Nephin,
Far above the foggy fields of Tirawley.

With the yellow-knotted spear-shaft, with the bow,
With the steel, prompt to deal shot and blow,
He taught him from year to year,
And trained him, without a peer,
For a perfect cavalier,
Hoping so—
Far his forethought—
For vengeance on the Barretts of Tirawley.

And when mounted on his proud-bounding steed,
Emon Oge sat a cavalier indeed ;
Like the ear upon the wheat,
When the winds in autumn beat
On the bending stems his seat ;
And the speed
Of his courser
Was the wind from Barna-na-gee o'er Tirawley !

Fifteen years have passed and the youth is perfected in all the accomplishments of sport and war, and the Lynott thinks it is time to return to the world and work out the scheme of his vengeance. So the father and son quit their mountain solitude, and journey southward to the bailey of Castlebar; and in a few fine touches the picture of MacWilliam's grandeur, as it strikes the boy's wondering eyes, rises before us; the stone house, strong and great, and the horse-host at the gate and their captain in armour, and the beautiful *Bantierna* by his side with her little pearl of a daughter. Who should this be but the mighty MacWilliam! Into his presence ride the Lynotts; and, after salutations, the old man declares his business. He has come to claim, as gossip-law allows, the fosterage of MacWilliam's son. Ever since William Conquer's time, his race were wont to place a MacWilliam Oge in the charge of a Briton of Tirawley; and the young Lynott was a pledge for his father's capacity in such tutelage. When MacWilliam saw the young Lynott ride, run, and shoot, he said he would give the spoil of a county to have his son so accomplished. When Lady MacWilliam heard him speak, and scanned his fresh and hardy air, she said she would give a purse of red gold that her Tibbot had such a nurse as had reared the young Briton. The custom was allowed. The young MacWilliam was sent under the guidance of old Lynott into Tirawley, and Emon Oge remained as a hostage in Castlebar. So back to Garranard, no longer the "loud-shriek-echoing," old Lynott returns—

So back to strong-throng-gathering Garranard,
 Like a lord of the country with his guard,
 Came the Lynott before them all,
 Once again o'er Clochan-na-n'all,
 Steady-striding, erect, and tall,
 And his ward
 On his shoulders;
 To the wonder of the Welshmen of Tirawley.

And then the young Tibbot was taught all manner of feats of body, to swim, to shoot, to gallop, to wrestle, to fence, and to run, until he grew up as deft and as tough as Emon Oge. But he was taught other lessons as well, which were not in the bond of his foster-father.

The lesson of hell he taught him in heart and mind;
 For to what desire soever he inclined,
 Of anger, lust, or pride,

He had it gratified,
Till he ranged the circle wide
Of a blind
Self-indulgence,

Ere he came to youthful manhood in Tirawley.

Shame and rage track his passage, till one night the young Barretts of the Bac fell upon him at Cornassack and slew him. His body was borne to Castlebar. The Brehons were summoned to judgment; and over the bier of MacWilliam Oge began the plea for an eric to be imposed upon the Barretts for their crime; and the Brehons decreed the mulct, and Lynott's share of it was nine ploughlands and nine score of cattle. And now the ultimate hour of the blind old man's vengeance had come, not to be sated with land and kine. "Rejoice," he cried, "in your ploughlands and your cattle, which I renounce throughout Tirawley." But, expert in all the rules and customs of the clans, he asks the Brehons, Is it not the law that the foster-father may, if he please, applot the short eric? And they say it is so. Whereupon, formally rejecting his own share of the mulct, he makes his award—that the land of the Barretts shall be equally divided on every side with the Burkes, and that MacWilliam shall have a seat in every Barrett's hall, a stall in every Barrett's stable, and needful grooming from every hosteler for every Burke who shall ride throughout Tirawley for ever. And then, in a speech full of barbaric sublimity and tragic concentration of passion, he confesses "the patient search and vigil long" of his vengeance. It is almost unjust to break the closely-wrought chain of this speech by a single quotation, and we have been already unduly tempted to extract from this extraordinary poem; but, perhaps, this one verse may be separated from the rest as containing the very culmination of the old man's hideous rage.

I take not your eyesight from you as you took
Mine and ours : I would have you daily look
On one another's eyes,
When the strangers tyrannize
By your hearths, and blushes rise
That ye brook
Without vengeance

The insults of troops of Tibbots throughout Tirawley.

Another moment and he has done. "Father and son," says Mac William, "hang them high!" and old Lynott they hanged forthwith; but young Lynott had eloped with Mac William's daughter to Scotland, and there changed his name to Edmund Lindsay. The judgment of the short eric was, however,

held good ; and the Burkes rode rough-shod over the Barretts, until as Mr. Ferguson, almost verbally versifying the Chronicle of Duaid Mac Firbis, says :—

Till the Saxon Oliver Cromwell,
And his valiant Bible-guided
Free heretics of Clan London
Coming in, in their succession,
Rooted out both Burke and Barrett ;

a process of eviction which Mr. Ferguson, not merely for the sake of poetical justice, but out of the invincible ignorance of pure Puritanical Protestantism, appears on the whole very highly to approve.

This ballad is indeed unique in its order : no Irish ballad approaches its wild sublimity and the thoroughness of detail with which it is conceived and executed. The only Irish narrative ballad which can bear a general comparison with it is Mr. Florence MacCarthy's "Foray of Con O'Donnell," a poem as perfect in its historical reality, in the aptness of all its figures, illustrations, and feats of phrase to a purely Celtic ideal, and which even surpasses "the Welshmen" in a certain easy and lissome grace of melody, that falls on the ear like the delicately drawn notes of Carolan's music. But this grace is disdained by the grim and compressed character which animates every line of Mr. Ferguson's ballad. His other works, fine of fancy and ripe of phrase as they are, fall far below it. "The Tain-Quest" does not on the whole enthrall the reader, or magnetize the memory. "The Healing of Conall Carnach," and "The Burial of King Cormac" are poems that will hold their place in many future Books of Irish Ballads ; they are unusually spirited versifications of passages from the more heroic period of early Irish history ; but excepting occasional lines, they only appear to be the versifications of already written legends. The ballad of Grace O'Malley, commonly called *Grana Uaile*, may be advantageously contrasted with these, and it contains some verses of singular power—as, for example, where the poet denies the imputation of piracy against this lady who loved to roam the high seas under her own commission—

But no : 'twas not for sordid spoil
Of barque or sea-board borough,
She plough'd with unfatiguing toil
The fluent-rolling furrow ;
Delighting on the broad-back'd deep
To feel the quivering galley
Strain up the opposing hill, and sweep
Down the withdrawing valley.

"Aideen's Grave" is a poem of a different kind, full of an exquisite melancholy grace; and where Ossian is supposed to apostrophize his future imitator, it is as if he thought after the manner of the Fenians, but was withal master of every symphony of the English tongue,—

Imperfect in an alien speech
 When wandering here some child of chance,
 Through pangs of keen delight shall reach
 The gift of utterance,—
 To speak the air, the sky to speak,
 The freshness of the hill to tell,
 Who roaming bare Ben Edar's peak,
 And Aideen's briary dell,
 And gazing on the Cromlech vast,
 And on the mountain and the sea,
 Shall catch communion with the past,
 And mix himself with me.

There are lines in this poem that a little remind us of Gray, as—

At Gavra, when by Oscar's side
 She rode the ridge of war;

and again in the "Farewell to Deirdre" there is something in the cast and rhythm of the poem, rather than in any individual word or line, that recalls Scott's "Farewell to North Maveen." But to say so is not to hit blots. Mr. Ferguson's is beyond question the most thoroughly original vein of poetry that any Irish Bard of late days has wrought out; and in laying down this volume we can only regret that the specimens he has thought worthy of collection are so few in comparison not merely with what he might have done, but with what he actually has done. For this modesty, let us hope that the prompt penance of a second and enlarged edition may atone.

We have said that though Mr. Ferguson could hardly be called a Young Irelander in politics, all the elective affinities of his genius tended towards that school of thought. But Lady Wilde, then known, if she wrote prose as Mr. John Fanshawe Ellis, and if she wrote verse as *Speranza*, had an extraordinary influence on all the intellectual and political activities of Young Ireland. It was a favourite phantasy of that time, when Lamartine's book was intoxicating all Young Europe with the idea of a grand coming revolutionary epopœia, and the atrocities of Socialism in France and Mazzinianism in Italy had not yet horrified all Christendom, to find the model men for a modern Plutarch in the ranks

of the Girondists. Notably Meagher was supposed to be gifted with all the qualities of Vergniaud, and Speranza to have more than the genius of Madame Roland. But when we come to real comparisons of character, the parallel easily gives way. If Smith O'Brien was like any Frenchman of the first Revolution, it was Lafayette. Mitchel had in certain respects a suspicious resemblance to the earlier and milder phases of Robespierre's peculiar intellectual idiosyncrasy. The base of Carnot's character was that faculty for organization which was the mainspring of Gavan Duffy's various and powerful genius. The parallel was, even so far as it went, intrinsically unjust. Lamartine's glowing imagination gave to the Girondists a grandeur largely ideal. It is fair to say that Meagher's oratory was on the whole of a higher order than Vergniaud's; and certainly Madame Roland, great as may have been the influence of her character and her conversation, has left us no example of her talent that will bear comparison with Lady Wilde's poems or prose.

These poems, however, if full justice is to be done to them, ought to be read from first to last with a running commentary in the memory from the history of those few tragic years, whose episodes they in a manner mark. One poem is a mournfully passionate appeal to O'Connell against the alliance with the Whigs, which was charged as one of the causes of the secession. Another is a Ballad of the Famine, with lights as ghastly as ever glowed in the imagination of Euripides or Dante, and founded on horrors such as Greek or Italian never witnessed. There is then a picture of "the young Patriot Leader"—which an artist would characterize as a decidedly idealized portrait of Meagher—that American General who has since proved his title to be called "of the sword." Again, a gloomy series of images recalls to us the awful state of the country—the corpses that were buried without coffins, and the men and women that walked the roads more like corpses than living creatures, spectres and skeletons at once; the little children out of whose sunken eyes the very tears were dried, and over whose bare little bones the hideous fur of famine had begun to grow; the cholera cart, with its load of helpless huddled humanity, on its way to the hospital; the emigrant ship sending back its woeful wail of farewell from swarming poop to stern in the offing; and, far as the eye could search the land, the blackened potato-fields, filling all the air with the fetid odours of decay. Again and again such pictures are contrasted with passionate lyrics full of rebellious fire, urging the people to die, if die they must, by the sword rather than by hunger—and sometimes, too, with an angry,

unreasonable, readily-forgiven reproach to the Priesthood, who bore with such noble fortitude and self-immolating charity the very cross of all the crosses of that terrible time.

It is a curious fact, and reminds one of the myth of Achilles' heel, that O'Connell, who marched among his myriad foes like one clad in panoply of mail from head to foot, with a sort of inexpugnable vigour and endurance, not to be wounded, not to be stunned, with his buckler ready for every thrust, and a blow for every blow that rained on his casque—was weak as a child under the influence of verse. Any one who may count over the number of times his favourite quotations, such as the lines beginning "Hereditary Bondsmen" from "Childe Harold" for example, crop up in the course of his speeches, will be inclined to say that his fondness for poetry was almost preposterous. It was always tempting him, indeed, into dangerous ways—for while his prose preached "the ethereal principles of moral force," and the tenet that "no political amelioration is worth the shedding of a single drop of human blood," his favourite quotations were strictly in favour of fighting. The "hereditary bondsmen" were to "strike the blow;" and the Irish are a nation only too well disposed to interpret such a precept literally. Moore's melodies were always at the tip of his tongue; and Moore's "Slave so lowly," is indignantly urged not to pine in his chains, but to raise the green flag forthwith, and do or die. Some verses of O'Connell's own, of which he was at least equally fond, began—

Oh Erin ! shall it e'er be mine
To see thy sons in battle line ?

It was not altogether politic, especially when Young Ireland was gaining the ascendant, to use such quotations habitually; but the temptation seems to have been irresistible. So, on the other hand, may be conceived his excessive sensitiveness to anything sounding like a reproach, that reached him through the vehicle of verse. When Brougham or Stanley or Peel struck their hardest, they got in return rather more than they gave—when the whole House of Commons tried to stifle his voice, over all the din, Mr. Speaker heard himself with horror called upon to stop this "beastly bellowing." But when Moore wrote those lines—so cruelly touching, so terribly caustic—"The dream of those days," which appeared in the last number of the *Melodies*, the *Liberator* was, it is said, so deeply affected that he shed tears. So again, these lines of *Speranza*, which appeared in the *Nation* at the time of the Secession, stung him to the very heart:—

Gone from us—dead to us—he whom we worshipped so !

Low lies the altar we raised to his name ;

Madly his own hand hath shattered and laid it low—

Madly his own breath hath blasted his fame.

He whose proud bosom once raged with humanity,

He whose broad forehead was circled with might ;

Sunk to a time-serving, drivelling inanity—

God ! why not spare our loved country the sight ?

Was it the gold of the stranger that tempted him ?

Ah ! we'd have pledged to him body and soul ;

Toiled for him—fought for him—starved for him—died for him—

Smiled though our graves were the steps to his goal.

Breathed he one word in his deep, earnest whispering ?

Wealth, crown, and kingdom were laid at his feet ;

Raised he his right hand, the millions would round him cling—

Hush ! 'tis the Sassenach ally you greet.

It is a curious and, indeed, a very touching trait in O'Connell's character that an imputation conveyed in this form had a power to wound him, which all the articles of the morning papers and all the speeches of the evening debates had not. This redoubtable master of every weapon of invective, whose weighty words sometimes fell on his adversary like one of Ossian's Titans hurling boulders, or again burst into a motley cascade of quip and crank, and chaff, and wild, rampant ridicule, that (sometimes rather coarse and personal) was, at its best, to other rhetoric, as the music of an Irish jig is to all other music—nevertheless had his Achilles' tendon. The man who loved to call himself "the best abused man in the universe" was as weak before the enemy who attacked him according to the rules of prosody as if he lived in the age when every Celt in Kerry piously believed that a man, if the metre were only made sufficiently acrid, might be rhymed to death, in the same manner as an ancestor of Lord Derby was, according to the Four Masters.*

* "John Stanley came to Ireland as the King of England's Viceroy—a man who gave neither toleration nor sanctuary to ecclesiastics, laymen, or literary men ; but all with whom he came in contact he subjected to cold, hardship, and famine ; and he it was who plundered Niall, the son of Hugh O'Higgin, at Uisneach of Meath ; but Henry D'Alton plundered James Tuite and the king's people, and gave to the O'Higgins a cow in lieu of each cow of which they had been plundered, and afterwards escorted them into Connaught. The O'Higgins, on account of Niall, then satirized John Stanley, who only lived five weeks after the satirizing, having died from the venom of their satires. This was the second instance of the poetical influence of Niall O'Higgin's satires, the first having been the Clan Conway turning grey the night they plundered Niall at Clodoin, and the second the death of John Stanley."—ANNALS OF THE FOUR MASTERS, A.D. 1414.

Lady Wilde's verse has not at all the same distinctively Celtic character as Mr. Ferguson's. He aspires to be

Kindly Irish of the Irish,
Neither Saxon nor Italian ;

and his choice inspirations come from the life of the clans. Speranza's verse, so far as it has a specially Irish character, is of the most ancient type of that character. It is full of Oriental figures and illustrations. It is, when it is most Irish, rather cognate to Persian and Hebrew ways of thinking, forms of metaphor, redundance of expression—in its tendency to adjuration, in its habit of apostrophe, in its very peculiar and powerful but monotonous rhythm, which seems to pulsate on the ear with the even, strident stroke of a Hindoo drum. Where this peculiar poetry at all adapts itself to the vogue of the modern muse, it is easy to see that Miss Barrett had very great influence in determining the mere manner of Lady Wilde's genius. When in the midst of one very powerful poem, "The Voice of the Poor," these lines come in—

When the human rests upon the human,
All grief is light ;
But who lends one kind glance to illumine
Our life-long night ?
The air around is ringing with their laughter—
God has only made the rich to smile
But we—in our rags, and want, and woe—we follow after,
Weeping the while.

—we are tempted to note an unconscious homage to the author of "Aurora Leigh." But the character of Lady Wilde's verse is far more coloured by the range of her studies than by the influence of any special style. The general reader, who may not breathe at ease the political atmosphere of the earlier part of this volume, will pause with pleasure to observe the spirit, grace, and fidelity of the translations which succeed. They are from almost every language in Europe, whether of Latin or Teutonic origin, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, German, Swedish, Danish, and Russian. Among these may be mentioned in particular two hymns of Savonarola, which are rendered so exquisitely that one is tempted to suggest that the "*Carmina Sedulii*," with much more of the ancient Irish hymnology, are as yet untranslated into the tongue now used in Ireland. It is a work peculiarly adapted to her genius. The first quality of Lady Wilde's poetry is that lyrical power, of which the hymn is the finest development ;

and her most striking poems are those which assume the character of the older and more regular form of ode.

The readers of Mr. William Allingham's earlier writings were in general gratefully surprised, when it was announced that he was the author of a very remarkable poem of the order of eclogue, which appeared by parts in *Fraser's Magazine*, in 1863. His earlier poems, chiefly songs and verse of society, were pleasing from a certain airy grace and lightness; but on the whole their style was thin and jejune. Of late, his faculties have evidently mellowed very rapidly, and his language has become more animated, more concentrated, and more sustained. "Laurence Bloomfield in Ireland" has had, as it were, a triple success—the success of a pamphlet, the success of a novel of Irish life, and its own more proper and legitimate success, as a regular pastoral, skilfully conceived, carefully executed, in which the flow of thought is sustained at a very even, if not a very lofty level throughout, and whose language is on the whole admirably harmonized, full of happy allusional effects, of quaint, minute, picturesque delineation, and of a certain graceful and easy energy. Mr. Gladstone has quoted some of its lines in a speech on the Budget as an excuse for maintaining the duty on whisky; and he is not the only Englishman who has derived from its perusal an unexpected insight into some of the more perplexing problems of Irish life. Certainly, Mr. Allingham's views of Irish society, when he touches on questions of religion and politics, are not our views. He is an Ulster Protestant by religion, and an advanced liberal (we take it) in politics. But making these allowances, it must be admitted that he shows the poet's many-sided sympathetic mind in every page of this very remarkable poem. "It is," as he fairly says, "free from personalities, and neither of an orange nor a green complexion; but it is Irish in phraseology, character, and local colour—with as little use as might be of a corrupt dialect, and with no deference at all to the stage traditions of Paddyism." It is divided into twelve chapters, and it is written in pleasantly modulated pentameters.

The story is of the life of a young squire, who was on the point of declaring himself a Young Irelander in his youth. His guardian, to cut the folly short, sent him incontinently to Cambridge, thence to the Continent. He returns to Ireland in his twenty-sixth year, and finds the population decimated by the famine, and agitated by agrarian conspiracy. The neighbouring gentry are bent, as conacre has ceased to pay, on supplanting the population by cattle. The population sup-

purates into secret societies. Laurence Bloomfield, long revolving the difficulties of his lot, and abhorring pretty equally the crimes of each class against the other—determined, moreover, to be neither exterminator, demagogue, nor absentee—resolves to live among the people of his estate like a modern patriarch, and see what patience, kindness, a good understanding, and enlightened management may be able to effect. He extinguishes the Ribbon Lodge, fastens his tenantry by equitable leases to the glebe, and gradually finds in the management of his estate a career of easy, pleasant, and even prosperous power. In the course of ten years, Lisnamoy has become an Irish Arcadia, and Mr. Allingham's honest muse rises accordingly to sing a hero even more memorable in his way than the Man of Ross.

Bloomfield first promulgates his peculiar views of territorial administration at a dinner of his landlord neighbours in Lisnamoy House, where the wholesale eviction of the tenantry of a large neighbouring district is proposed on the plea that—

“this country sorely needs

A quicker clearance of its human weeds ;
But still the proper system is begun,
And forty holdings we shall change to one.”

Bloomfield his inexperience much confess'd,
Doubts if the large dispeopled farms be best,—
Best in a wide sense, best for all the world,
(At this expression sundry lips were curl'd)—

“I wish but know not how each peasant's hand
Might work, nay, hope to win, a share of land ;
For ownership, however small it be,
Breeds diligence, content, and loyalty,
And tirelessly compels the rudest field,
Inch after inch, its very most to yield.
Wealth might its true prerogatives retain ;
And no man lose, and all men greatly gain.”

It is from the ill-concealed contempt of his class for such thoughts as these, that Bloomfield's resolution to remain in Ireland and administer his own estate, arises.

The story, as it is evolved, presents some charming sketches of character. Hardly even Carleton has delineated so admirably the nature and habits of the Irish peasant family, as Mr. Allingham has done in his picture of the Dorans. How easy and natural, for example, is the portrait of Bridget Doran :—

Mild oval face, a freckle here and there,
Clear eyes, broad forehead, dark abundant hair,

Pure placid look that show'd a gentle nature,
 Firm, unperplex'd, were hers ; the maiden's stature
 Graceful arose, and strong, to middle height,
 With fair round arms, and footstep free and light ;
 She was not showy, she was always neat
 In every gesture, native and complete,
 Disliking noise, yet neither dull nor slack,
 Could throw a rustic banter briskly back,
 Reserved but ready, innocently shrewd,—
 In brief a charming flower of womanhood.

The occasional sketches of Irish scenery are also very vividly outlined. This of Lough Braccan is not perhaps the best, but it is the most easily detached from the text :—

Among those mountain skirts a league away,
 Lough Braccan spread, with many a silver bay
 And islet green ; a dark cliff, tall and bold,
 Half-muffled in its cloak of ivy old,
 Bastioned the southern brink, beside a glen,
 Where birch and hazel hid the badger's den,
 And through the moist ferns and firm hollies play'd
 A rapid rivulet, from light to shade.
 Above the glen, and wood, and cliff, was seen,
 Majestically simple and serene,
 Like some great soul above the various crowd,
 A purple mountain-top, at times in cloud
 Or mist, as in celestial veils of thought,
 Abstracted heavenward.

We may give another specimen of Mr. Allingham's power of delineation, which shows that he has studied Irish country life as carefully as Irish scenery and Irish physiognomy.

Mud hovels fringe the "fair green" of this town,
 A spot misnamed, at every season brown,
 O'erspread with countless man and beast to-day,
 Which bellow, squeak, and shout, bleat, bray, and neigh.
 The "jobbers" there each more or less a rogue,
 Noisy or smooth, with each his various brogue,
 Cool, wiry Dublin, Connaught's golden mouth,
 Blunt Northern, plaintive sing-song of the South,
 Feel cattle's ribs, or jaws of horses try,
 For truth, since men's are very sure to lie,
 And shun, with parrying blow and practised heed,
 The rushing horns, the wildly prancing steed.
 The moistened penny greets with sounding smack
 The rugged palm, which smites the greeting back ;
 Oaths fly, the bargain like a quarrel burns,
 And oft the buyer turns, and oft returns :

Now mingle Sassenach and Gaelic tongue ;
 On either side are slow concessions wrung ;
 An anxious audience interfere ; at last
 The sale is closed, and whisky binds it fast,
 In case of quilting upon oziars bent,
 With many an ancient patch and breezy rent.

This is as true a picture in its way as Mdle. Rosa Bonheur's "Horsefair."

Mr. Aubrey de Vere's "Inisfail" comes last on our list, but certainly not least in our estimation. No poet of Young Ireland has like him seized and breathed the spirit of his country's Catholic nationality, its virginal purity of faith, its invincible patience of hope, and all the gentle sweetness of its charity. Young Ireland rather studied the martial muse, and that with an avowed purpose. "The Irish Harp," said Davis, "too much loves to weep. Let us, while our strength is great and our hopes high, cultivate its bolder strains, its raging and rejoicing; or if we weep, let it be like men whose eyes are lifted though their tears fall." Mr. de Vere has tried every mood of the native lyre, and proved himself master of all. His "Inisfail" is a ballad chronicle of Ireland, such as Young Ireland would have thought to be a worthy result of all its talents, and such as, in fact, Mr. Duffy at one time proposed. But it must be said that its heroic ballads are not equal to those of Young Ireland. Some one said of a very finished, but occasionally frigid Irish speaker, fifteen years ago, that he spoke like "Sheil with the chill on." A few of Mr. de Vere's ballads have the same effect of "Young Ireland with the chill on." They want the *verve*, the glow, the energy, the resonance, which belong to the best ballads of "The Spirit of the Nation." Of the writers of that time, Mr. D'Arcy McGee is perhaps, on the whole, the most kindred genius to his. Mr. De Vere has an insight into all the periods of Irish history in their most poetical expression, which Mr. McGee alone of his comrades seems to have equally possessed. Indeed, if Mr. McGee's poems were all collected and chronologically arranged—as it is to be hoped they may be some day soon—it would be found that he had unconsciously and desultorily traversed very nearly the same complete extent of ground that Mr. De Vere has systematically and deliberately gone over. But though no one has written more nobly of the dimly glorious Celtic ages, and many of his battle-ballads are instinct with life, and wonderfully picturesque, it is easy to see that Mr. McGee's best desire was to follow the footsteps of the early Saints, and the *Via Dolorosa* of the period of the Penal Laws. These, too, are the passages over which Mr. De Vere's genius most

loves to brood, and his prevailing view of Ireland is the supernatural view of her destiny to carry the Cross and spread the Faith. Young Ireland wrote its bold, brilliant ballads, as a part of the education of the new nationality that it believed was growing up, and destined to take possession of the island—"a nationality that," to use Davis's words again, "must contain and represent all the races of Ireland. It must not be Celtic; it must not be Saxon; it must be Irish. The Brehon law and the maxims of Westminster, the cloudy and lightning genius of the Gael, the placid strength of the Saxon, the marshalling insight of the Norman; a literature which shall exhibit in combination the passions and idioms of all, and which shall equally express our mind, in its romantic, its religious, its forensic, and its practical tendencies. Finally, a native government, which shall know and rule by the might and right of all, yet yield to the arrogance of none;—these are the components of such a nationality." And such was the dream that seemed an easy eventuality twenty years ago. But Mr. De Vere writes after the Famine and in view of the Exodus. His mind goes from the present to the past by ages of sorrow—of sorrow, nevertheless, illumined, nurtured, and sustained by Divine faith, and the living presence of the Church. So in the most beautiful poem of this volume, he sees the whole Irish race carrying an inner spiritual life through all their tribulation in the guise of a great religious order, of which England is the foundress, and the rules are written in the statute-book. We cannot select a better specimen of the thorough Catholic tone of Mr. De Vere's genius, and of the vivid power and finished grace of his poetry, than this:—

There is an Order by a northern sea,
Far in the West, of rule and life more strict
Than that which Basil rear'd in Galilee,
In Egypt Paul, in Umbria Benedict.

Discalced it walks; a stony land of tombs,
A strange Petraea of late days, it treads!
Within its court no high-tossed censer fumes;
The night-rain beats its cells, the wind its beds.

Before its eyes no brass-bound, blazon'd tome
Reflects the splendour of a lamp high hung:
Knowledge is banish'd from her earliest home
Like wealth: it whispers psalms that once it sung.

It is not bound by the vow celibate,
Lest, through its ceasing, anguish too might cease;

In sorrow it brings forth ; and Death and Fate
Watch at Life's gate, and tithe the unripe increase.

It wears not the Franciscan's sheltering gown ;
The cord that binds it is the Stranger's chain :
Scarce seen for scorn, in fields of old renown
It breaks the clod ; another reaps the grain.

Year after year it fasts ; each third or fourth
So fasts that common fasts to it are feast ;
Then of its brethren many in the earth
Are laid unrequiem'd like the mountain beast.

Where are its cloisters ? Where the felon sleeps !
Where its novitiate ? Where the last wolf died !
From sea to sea its vigil long it keeps—
Stern Foundress ! is its Rule not mortified ?

Thou that hast laid so many an Order waste,
A Nation is thine Order ! It was thine
Wide as a realm that Order's seed to cast,
And undispensed sustain its discipline !

It is another curious illustration of the *Hibernis ipsis Hibernior* that a De Vere, who is, moreover, "of the caste of Vere de Vere," should have so intimate a comprehension of the Celtic spirit as is often shown in these poems, especially in the use of those allegories which are so characteristic of the period of persecution, and in some of his metres that appear to be instinct with the very melody of the oldest Irish music. Here, indeed, we seem to taste, in a certain vague and dreamy sensation, which the mere murmur of such verses even without strict reference to the words produces, all the charm of which that ancient poetry might have been capable, if it were still cultivated in a language of living civilization. Several of these poems, if translated into Irish verse, would probably pass back without the change of an idiom—so completely Celtic is the whole conception of the language. The dirges, for example, appear on a first reading to be only English versions of Irish poems belonging to the time of the Jacobites and the Brigade—until, as we examine more carefully, we observe that the allegory is wrought out with all the finish of more modern art, and that the metaphors are brought into a more just inter-dependence than the native bard usually thought necessary.

The tenderness that approaches to a sort of worship of Ireland under the poetical personification of a mother wailing for her children, again and again breaks out in Mr. De Vere's verse ; and in all the range of Irish poetry it is nowhere more

exquisitely expressed. The solemn beauty of the following verses is like that of some of those earliest of the melodies, whose long lines, with their curious rippling rhythm, were evidently meant for recitation as well as for musical effect:—

In the night, in the night, O my country, the stream calls out from afar :

So swells thy voice through the ages, sonorous and vast :

In the night, in the night, O my country, clear flashes the star :

So flashes on me thy face through the gloom of the past.

I sleep not ; I watch : in blows the wind ice-wing'd, and ice-fingered :

My forehead it cools and slakes the fire in my breast ;

Though it sighs o'er the plains where oft thine exiles look'd back, and long lingered,

And the graves where thy famish'd lie dumb and thine outcasts find rest.

Hardly less sad, but in so different a spirit as to afford a contrast that brings us to a fair measure of the variety of Mr. De Vere's powers, is a poem of the days of the Brigade. The wife of one of the soldiers who followed Sarsfield to France after the capitulation of Limerick, and entered the Irish brigade of Louis XIV., is supposed, sitting by the banks of the Shannon, to speak :—

River that through this purple plain
Toilest (once redder) to the main,
Go, kiss for me the banks of Seine !

Tell him I loved, and love for aye,
That his I am though far away—
More his than on the marriage-day.

Tell him thy flowers for him I twine
When first the slow sad mornings shine
In thy dim glass ; for he is mine.

Tell him when evening's tearful light
Bathes those dark towers on Aughrim's height,
There where he fought, in heart I fight.

A freeman's banner o'er him waves !
So be it ! I but tend the graves
Where freemen sleep whose sons are slaves.

Tell him I nurse his noble race,
Nor weep save o'er one sleeping face
Wherein those looks of his I trace.

For him my beads I count when falls
Moonbeam or shower at intervals
Upon our burn'd and blacken'd walls :

And bless him ! bless the bold brigade—
May God go with them, horse and blade,
For Faith's defence, and Ireland's aid !

Here the abrupt transition of tone in the last verse from the subdued melancholy of those which precede it is very fine and very Irish. One can fancy the widowed wife in all her desolation, starting, even from her beads, as she thinks of Lord Clare's Dragoons coming down on the enemy with their "*Viva la* for Ireland's wrong !"

Twenty years have now passed since the "*Spirit of the Nation*" gave some glimpses of the mine of poetry then latent in the Irish mind. In 1845 Mr. Gavan Duffy published his "*Ballad Poetry of Ireland*"—a book which had the largest sale of any published in Ireland since the Union, and probably the widest influence. Upon this common and neutral ground Orange-man and Ribbon-man, Whig, Tory, and Nationalist, were perforce brought into harmonious contact ; and "the Boyne Water" lost half its virus as a political psalm when it was embalmed side by side with the "*Wild Geese*" or "*Willy Reilly*." Behind the produce of his own immediate period, Mr. Duffy, in arranging his materials, could only find a few ballads by Moore, a few by Gerald Griffin, a few by Banim, Callanan, Furlong, and Drennan, that could be accounted legitimate ballad poetry. The rest was fast cropping up while he was actually compiling his collection, under the hot breath of the National movement, in a lavish and luxuriant growth. This impulse seems to have spent itself some years ago. Anything of real merit in the way of Irish poetry does not now appear in periodical literature more than once or twice in a year ; and Mr. Thomas Irwin is the only recent writer whose verse may fairly be named in the same breath with that which we have now noticed. A rich grace and finish of expression, a most quaint and delicate humour, and a fine-poised aptness of phrase distinguish his poetry, which is more according to the taste that Mr. Tennyson has established in England than that of any Irish writer of the day.

Irish poetry seems now, therefore, to have passed into a new and more advanced stage of development. Here are four volumes, by four separate writers, of poems, old and new—all published within a year ; and all, we believe, decidedly successful, and in satisfactory course of sale. Mr. Florence MacCarthy's poems had previously gone through several editions, and won enduring fame—perhaps more widely spread in America than even at home, on account of a quality some-

what kindred to the peculiar genius of the best American poets, and especially Longfellow, Poe, and Irving, that the reader will readily recognize in his finely-finished and most melodious verse. Nor should we omit to mention, in cataloguing the library of recent Irish poets, "The Monks of Kilcrea," a long romantic poem in the style of "The Lady of the Lake," which contains many a passage that Scott might own, but of which the writer remains unknown. Thus Irish national poetry is accumulating, as it were, in strata. Mr. Duffy set on the title-page of his "Ballad Poetry" the Irish motto, *Bolg an Dana*, which not all his readers clearly understood; but which to all who did, seemed extremely appropriate at the time. "This man," say the Four Masters, speaking of a great bard of the 15th century, "was called the *Bolg an Dana*, which signifies that he was a common Budget of Poetry." And this was all that Mr. Duffy's Ballad Poetry professed to be. But what was only a budget of desultory jetsam and flotsam in 1845 is taking the shape of a solid literature in 1865; and those twenty golden years have at all events been well filled with ranks of rhyme.

ART. III.—CAUSES AND OBJECTS OF THE WAR IN AMERICA.

1. *The Slave Power: its Character, Career, and Probable Designs.* Being an attempt to explain the real issues involved in the American Contest. By J. E. CAIRNES, M.A., &c. Second edition, much enlarged. London: Macmillan. 1864.
2. *American Disunion, Constitutional or Unconstitutional, &c.* By CHARLES ED. RAWLINS, Senior; London: Hardwicke. 1864.
3. *The Confederate Secession.* By the MARQUIS OF LOTHIAN. Edinburgh & London: Blackwood. 1864.

PROFESSOR Cairnes's work upon "the Slave Power" strikes us as the ablest and fairest statement which we have anywhere seen of the real objects and principles of the lamentable war which for four years past has desolated North America. Mr. Rawlins has given, in a small and unpretending volume, what seems to us a satisfactory answer to the arguments by which the well-known advocate of the Southern States, Mr. Spence, has attempted to prove that their secession from the Union was only the exercise of a constitutional right. We do not see that in the present state of things this is a very practical question; and perhaps to English readers the

chief permanent value of the work will be in the Appendices, which give us several very important documents, especially the text of that "Constitution of the United States" of which we hear so much, and know, in general, so little.

The Marquis of Lothian's book is in several ways remarkable. It would have been difficult to select a more favourable specimen by which to test the justice of the views about America; about the cause and progress of secession; about the nature and working of negro slavery, and the effects of the war both upon white and black, which an Englishman adopts when he trusts to the Southern sources of information. Lord Lothian is a high-born, high-spirited, and highly educated English gentleman, utterly above all suspicion of being interested or of intentional misrepresentation; a gentleman, too, of more than average talents, attainments, and activity of mind, as attested both by his university career and by his subsequent travels, far beyond the ordinary limits of the "grand tour," even as that time-honoured institution has now been extended. He illustrates the ordinary state of mind of men of his class the more faithfully, from the very fact that not having personally visited America, he does not profess to speak as a witness. Rather he is a judge, summing up the evidence which has been brought before men of his class, and the conclusions which they have formed upon it. We greatly fear that his judgment may be taken as a specimen of that formed by the great majority of educated Englishmen. His summing-up is dated Sept. 9, 1864. Let us see what it is.

Some eighty years ago the thirteen States which had just thrown off subjection to George III., started in the race for prosperity. In population, the North and the South were as nearly as possible equal, but in consideration and prosperity Virginia, which belonged to the South, decidedly held the first place. Unluckily, the two differed in natural character. Lord Lothian shall tell us how:—

History has often seen specimens of a similar conflict. There are two specific characters which have been opposed to each other in almost every age of the world. This opposition has come so often, that one would think nature had a particular pleasure in setting them together, in order to see which will prevail. The cases are always distinguished from one another by great shades of character being introduced, to prevent them from being absolutely identical, but a general family resemblance runs through the whole. One character is that of an open, free-handed, manly being, generally fond of pleasure, full of impulses, which on the whole are generous ones, not deficient in ability, and ability sometimes of a high order; careless, self-confident, rather arrogant, and sometimes not very scrupulous. The

other is of a different type—crafty, cold-blooded, intensely selfish, clear in the perception of what he wants, and determined to get it at any cost, often inferior to his antagonist in talent, but superior to him in the obstinacy with which he pursues his object—an obstinacy which is rarely shaken by any feeling of mercy, or by any shrinking from meanness or crime. It is also a part of their respective characters that, while the first is sometimes a free-thinker, and, if he is religious, does not say much about it, the second makes a great parade of godliness, and that not necessarily out of hypocrisy, but because he has great faith in the externals of religion, and, in fact, is apt to be extremely superstitious. The earliest instance of this antagonism that we know of, was displayed more than seventeen centuries B.C., in the persons of Esau and Jacob; and it was only the opportune death of one of the parties, just as the struggle was commencing, which has prevented us from seeing it renewed on a very great scale, in the century in which we live—(p. 34).

This extract is valuable, as showing the talents of the writer. A man who can write thus, ought not to publish a volume on the secession without throwing some new light upon it. Unfortunately, he believes that this Jacob and Esau theory is the master-key to all events in the United States, at least since their independence. From the commencement of the Union, "New England was largely manufacturing," while "the Southern States were not manufacturing." "The North was, or might be, self-supporting. It manufactured its own implements, it made its own clothing; it grew its own corn. Its connection with Europe, as far as its own productions were concerned, consisted in selling its surplusage and receiving foreign gold in return. But with the South it was far different. The Southern States were dependent on foreigners for subsistence. They had, it is true, plenty of cattle. But the products of their soil were only valuable as articles of commerce." "It was, therefore, the interest of the South to have free trade, and that of the North to have heavy protection duties." The result of this was that Jacob made poor Esau pay to such an amount, that all the comparative poverty of the Southern States comes from this one sole cause (p. 51). "Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia, may be said to defray three-fourths of the annual expense of supporting the Federal government;* and of this great sum

* Mr. Stevens, now "Vice-President of the Confederate States," said in the Georgia Convention of Jan. 1861: "Again, look at another item, and one, be assured, in which we have a great and vital interest: it is that of revenue, or means of supporting government. From official documents, we learn that a fraction over three-fourths of the revenue collected for the support of government has uniformly been raised from the North. The expense for the transportation of the mail in the Free States was, by the report of the Postmaster-General for the year 1860, a little over 13,000,000 dollars, while

annually furnished by them, nothing, or next to nothing, is returned to them in the shape of government expenditure. That expenditure flows in an opposite direction—it flows northward, in one uniform uninterrupted perennial stream. *This is the reason why wealth disappears in the South, and rises up in the North. Federal legislation does all this.*” * Here we have the key to all the troubles the United States have known. The relations of the South to the North have been those of the rabbit to the stoat which has fixed its teeth in the poor creature’s neck. Jacob has always been successfully sucking Esau’s blood : Esau ineffectually shrieking, struggling,

the income was 19,000,000 dollars. But in the Slave States, the transportation of the mail was 14,716,000 dollars, while the revenue from the same was 8,001,026 dollars, leaving a deficit of 6,115,735 dollars to be supplied by the North for our accommodation; and without it we must have been entirely cut off from this most essential branch of government.”

* These words our author quotes, with approbation, from an American speaker. It would be a severe demand on the patience both of writers and readers even to enumerate the unfounded statements in Lord Lothian’s volume. It may, however, be worth while to enter a passing protest against one assumption, which is, in fact, the foundation of his whole book—that the Southern States have been aggrieved by tariffs imposed by the Congress of the Union, against their will, by Northern votes, and to advance Northern interests. It is, from first to last, an absolute delusion. No doubt absurd tariffs have been a serious injury to all parts of the Union. Unfortunately, however, the people of the United States—and, as Professor Goldwin Smith points out, their statesmen also—are strangely ignorant of the first principles of financial and political economy, and are still believers (as Englishmen were not many years ago) in the good effect of commercial restrictions. As will always happen where this system is adopted at all, disputes have arisen in the United States between different parties, each of whom claimed, not free trade, but greater protection for its own interests ; and in 1832 one State (South Carolina) threatened to separate from the Union on account of these disputes. That it was not even then a question between North and South is proved by the notorious fact that the other Southern States were against her. Moreover, the complaint was met by an alteration of the tariff, and since that time no complaint has been made by the South on that subject. In fact, the tariff which was in force when the secession took place, was on the whole less restrictive than any had been since 1820 ; and, such as it was, it had been supported (as is pointed out by Mr. Stevens, the Vice-President of the Confederate States) by the votes of the Southern no less than of the Northern States ; and gave protection to Southern no less than Northern interests. Moreover, had the case been otherwise, that tariff could never have been adopted, for the President by whom it was approved, and by whom it could have been vetoed, was himself a Southern man and a slaveholder, and the Southern interest commanded a large majority in the Senate of the United States. In fact, there had been no period during many years at which the Southern States could not, and did not, carry through Congress any measure upon which they were really bent, and at which they could not have introduced free trade if they had wished it. Mr. Spence himself says, in speaking of the Secession, “Up to the present period the Southern interest has been paramount.” This tariff cry is one of those Southern productions which, as Lord Lothian says, are valuable only “for exportation to Europe.”

and striving to escape. At last, finding it a question of life or death, and seeing that Jacob was resolved to take all he had, poor Esau set up for himself. As to the slavery question, it really seems that the whole dispute between the North and South might have been fully discussed without any allusion to it. However, it must be admitted that slavery was concerned in the "battle of the territories." "Strict justice demanded that all new states should be slave states, or states in which Northern and Southern citizens might alike settle and find their own level;" but "the exacerbated state of mind arising out of the long national contest which had been growing more and more irreconcilable, interposed a fatal barrier to the course which justice demanded. Congress did attempt to legislate, the legislation had for its object to keep the Southerners out of the territories which belonged to them as well as to their rivals." The South really did not care, "apart from the point of honour," about the free-soil legislation, but "the certainty that a Free-soil victory was also a protectionist victory, made it absolutely incumbent on those who were opposed to the latter to oppose the former." "The protectionist element of the alliance made it, for the South, a question of life and death." "Thus it was merely for its bearing on free trade that the Southern States cared about the slave question at all."

We must cut short our extracts, merely remarking that, in addition to all these strange delusions, Lord Lothian believes that the North repudiated the "Missouri compromise," that "it passed a law prohibiting slavery in the state of California," that the "fugitive slave law" was passed unanimously in 1789, and that the South cared nothing for the laws made by numerous Northern States to prevent the enforcement of that law, "except as insults," because "the * Northern States were not such a Paradise for the negroes, that they often tried to avail themselves of them;" that "free blacks die off like rotten sheep" at "New York, and generally through the Northern States and in British North America;" that "in a warm climate, where they are not actually persecuted, they spend their time in doing absolutely nothing, trusting for their subsistence to the bounty of unassisted nature"—that "the

* It is well known that in Canada alone there are whole villages of escaped slaves. Miss Martineau states that "in one free state on the Ohio, fifteen hundred fugitives were known to have passed through in a single year, and there was no getting them back." This was after the passing of the fugitive slave law. The declaration of the causes of secession by the Confederate States insists particularly on this point, as did President Buchanan, in the concessions by which he proposed to tempt them to return to the Union.

Southern conscience is remarkably clear as to that part of the system of slavery, which is most inexcusable in theory, and has been most cruel in practice—namely, the African slave trade. Through their whole history there has been a long struggle both against Old England and New England to prevent its introduction.” He complains, moreover, that “Virginia is accused by the inventive genius of New England of breeding slaves for the market,” and “of this, at any rate,” he is pleased to tell us that he “disposes.” In these border states, he believes slavery would have been abolished, as it was in the North, but for “the anti-slavery cry,” although it would no doubt have been difficult, inasmuch as the laws of the Gulf States prevent any slaves being introduced into them from other states.* As to the Gulf States themselves,

* A person who can manage to believe this statement may believe anything. We are willing to assume that the laws may really exist in the statute book, by quoting which our author imagines that he has disproved the existence of a regular slave trade between Virginia and other border states on the one hand, and South Carolina and the Gulf States on the other. But to suppose that such enactments (if they exist) can disprove certain and notorious facts, patent to all the world, is worthy only of Mr. Anthony Froude, who thinks that he has proved that when Henry VIII. divorced and beheaded his old wives, to take new ones, he could not possibly have been actuated by irregular passion, because he passed an act of Parliament, in the preamble of which it is expressly stated that his motive was merely a patriotic desire of legitimate offspring. The slave trade in question is quite as certain and notorious as the execution of Anne Boleyn and the divorce of Catharine. It is proved by the population returns of Virginia, Maryland, Kentucky, and the more southern states. Professor Cairnes shows (p. 128) that in 1829 “a law was passed in Louisiana interposing obstacles to the introduction of slaves, and that within two hours after this was known, the price of slaves on the breeding grounds of the North fell 25 per cent.” This fact, so far from being a secret, was stated by Judge Upshur, in the Convention of Virginia. Mr. Wise, the successful candidate for the office of governor of Virginia, publicly stated that but for the exclusion of slaves from California, the price of slaves in Virginia would have risen to 5,000 dollars. Mr. Brodnax, a member, expressly declared in a speech in the legislature of Virginia, “It is not the *domestic* demand for slave labour which has ever graduated their power here. Their labour is infinitely more productive in the sugar and rice and cotton plantations of the South and West, than it can ever be rendered in Virginia, and consequently their value here must very much depend on the demand there. No man could, from mere pecuniary considerations, afford to give five hundred dollars for a slave, to be worked on an ordinary Virginian plantation.” Mr. Russell was told by an engineer on the North Carolina railroad, that on one occasion he had taken south 600 slaves in one train. We are ashamed to waste time on proofs of a fact quite as notorious to all who know anything on the subject as the existence of the states themselves. But since Lord Lothian lays so much store on legislative acts, let him observe two facts—first, that provision is expressly made for the continuance of this internal slave trade in the new constitution adopted in 1861, by the Confederate States after their secession. By that constitution slaves may, notwithstanding the separation, be imported

he does "not see how slavery could have been dispensed with, the climate would not admit of white labour," and blacks, he

from the United into the Confederate States; next, that in 1859 a committee was appointed by the House of Representatives of South Carolina (the very state which he mentions by name as having passed "stringent laws against the introduction of slaves from Virginia"), not for the purpose of enforcing those laws, but to report on the number and value of the slaves yearly bought by South Carolina and the other Southern States from Virginia, &c. What is more remarkable, this committee was appointed by the party which was then already agitating for the legal reopening of the African slave trade, and its object was to prove that the supply for the internal slave trade was insufficient. The object of the committee, therefore, was to rate this supply as low as possible. That committee reported that "in the ten years, 1840 to 1850, the number of slaves exported from the border States, of which nearly one half came from Virginia, was not less than 235,000. This will give an annual export of 23,500 slaves; and taking these at an average value of 700 dollars (which, considering that the bulk were slaves in the prime of life, would certainly not be an over-estimate), we arrive at a sum of 16,450,000 dollars, equivalent to about £3,290,000 sterling, as the annual value of this domestic slave trade" (Cairnes, p. 136). The fact is, and it is admitted by speakers in the Virginia legislature, that it is this demand for slaves in the South, and not as Lord Lothian fancies (p. 105) "the anti-slavery cry," which stopped the natural progress by which slavery was dying out in Virginia. But for the demand for slaves in the South, as Mr. Brodnax truly said, slavery would not have paid in Virginia. Slaves are valuable there, not to work, but to breed for sale, and the consequence is that since this demand became so great, the number of slaves in that state, which had been diminishing, began to increase, and continued to do so, until the present war. This internal slave trade is, perhaps, the most horrible part of the whole system, especially in connection with the prevalence of white colour in a large portion of the exported slaves, and with the laws which, by making the children of slave mothers follow the condition of their mothers, be their colour what it may, and by virtually prohibiting manumission, almost compel Virginia slave owners to sell their own illegitimate offspring.—See the forcible but not exaggerated remarks of Lord Macaulay on this subject, *Speech on the Sugar Duties* (1845). "I affirm that there exists in the United States a slave trade, not less odious or demoralizing; nay, I do on my conscience believe more odious and more demoralizing, than that which is [then was] carried on between Africa and Brazil. North Carolina and Virginia are to Louisiana and Alabama what Congo is to Rio Janeiro. God forbid that I should extenuate the horrors of the slave trade in any form! but I do think this its worst form. Bad enough it is that civilized men should sail to an uncivilized quarter of the world where slavery exists, should there buy wretched barbarians, and should carry them away to labour in a distant land: bad enough! But that a civilized man—a man proud of being a citizen of a free state—a man frequenting a Christian church, should breed slaves for exportation, and, if the whole horrible truth must be told, should even beget slaves for exportation—should see children, sometimes his own children, gambolling around him from infancy, should watch their growth, should become familiar with their faces, and should then sell them for from four to five hundred dollars a head, and send them to lead in a remote country a life which is a lingering death—a life about which the best thing that can be said is, that it is sure to be short,—this does, I own, excite a horror exceeding even the horror excited by that slave trade which is the curse of the African coast. And mark: I am not speaking of any rare case,

believes, never work "unless in the capacity of slaves."* In fact, after discussing the possibility that something might have been done, by very slow degrees, to elevate the blacks to a state fit for freedom, he admits:—"I cannot resist a slight feeling of amusement at my own arguments."

Such a book from such a man, is a remarkable, and, we must add, a melancholy phenomenon—a sign of the times. It is impossible to doubt the entire good faith of the author; his whole style is that of a man who so strongly feels himself to be in the right, that he cannot understand how any one can think otherwise. That Jacob and Esau afford a complete rationale of all the events of American history is, to him, not merely certain, but self-evident. Nay, so absolutely does he trust his Southern informants, that he tells us with a simplicity which is really charming, "The most remarkable circumstance of this war is, that all the good qualities have been on one side, and all the bad qualities on the other" (p. 185). Even the "horrors have been entirely on one side" (p. 194). Esau's whole way of doing things is so endearing, that even a defeat received from him, or a city burned by his armies, has in it something attractive.

We doubt whether anything in the book is more curious and characteristic than the statement which Lord Lothian has been induced to receive as explaining the origin of "the Republican party."† The real account of this event cannot

of any instance of eccentric depravity; I am speaking of a trade as regular as the trade in pigs between Dublin and Liverpool, or as the trade in coals between the Tyne and the Thames." (*Cairnes*, 313.)

* We have no space to do more than protest against this monstrous calumny. It has come, of course, from slave owners. Why should slaves work, except from compulsion? The experiment which has been tried in the British West India Islands, while it proves that emancipation, especially if imprudently worked out by the planters and the local legislature, was, at the moment, a fearful loss to too many of the existing race of planters, proves also that no men are more willing than the negroes to work for wages. The same fact has already been abundantly proved in America since the commencement of the present war.

† Our readers must not allow themselves to infer anything from the names assumed by political parties in America. Often, as in the celebrated case of the "Know-nothings" (which was a great combination against immigrants, and especially Catholics), they have no meaning at all, so far as we can discover. But when the name has an obvious meaning, we can by no means infer that the meaning has any connection with the principle or character of the party by which it is assumed. Thus, of late years, the two contending parties have been called, respectively, Democrats and Republicans; although there is no apparent reason why one should be considered as more democratical, or the other as more republican. Lord Lothian claims for the "Democratical party" (which he supports), the name of "Conservative." The "Republican" might more justly have been called the Free-soil party.

be given in a few words ; and what is worse, any statement of the facts is likely to be dry. And yet we fear that we cannot pass it over, for the right understanding of the cause of the existing civil war depends upon it.

The Republican party then was called into existence in the year 1856, by one of those reactions which, in all countries where a popular government exists, are apt to result from any unusually flagrant act of wrong and aggression, committed by a party which has long been possessed of power. Nothing is more certain than this tendency, and nothing more needful to be borne in mind by all who aspire to govern, whether in England or any of the countries which she has colonised. If the slave-holding party had not forgotten it, there is little doubt that it might at this moment have continued to wield from the White House at Washington the united strength of the two great countries now laid waste by this fearful civil war.

Almost forty years earlier, a keen dispute had for three years agitated the United States upon the question whether or not slavery should be introduced into the new states which were from time to time to be formed out of those huge regions of forest and prairie which stretch for so many hundreds of miles behind the new settled states of the Union, without any frontier towards the west except the Rocky Mountains, or even the Pacific Ocean. This vast unsettled territory, as well as the settled country bordering on the Mississippi, of which New Orleans was the capital, had long belonged to France, and (under the name of Louisiana) had been sold to the United States by Napoleon I. in 1803. His obvious object was to place in friendly hands a possession of immense value, which he could no longer retain in his own ; when, by renewing the war with Great Britain, he had cut himself off from communication with it by sea. Hence it was that a monarch insatiable of territory parted with half a continent, for the sum of £3,200,000. The greater part of these vast regions* (which included what

The main question in dispute between the two was, whether or not slavery should be extended to the as yet unsettled territories of the Union. It should be observed that, in a country which is professedly a democratical republic, such names, which sound to our ears so aggressive, often mean nothing more than a profession of loyalty to the existing constitution.

* The "Indian territory," now marked in the map of the United States to the west of Arkansas, together with New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, and California, were not parts of the province ceded by France. Neither did they belong to the United States at the period of which we are speaking. They, as well as Texas, were acquired from Mexico in 1845 and 1847 by the foulest means, and with the express object of extending negro slavery into regions from which, by a fundamental law of Mexico, it had for ever been excluded. It is important that this should be borne in mind, because the

are now the states of Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Minnesota, as well as Missouri, Arkansas, Kansas, and Nebraska), was by climate and character unsuited to slave cultivation. The question, however, arose, with regard to the district which now forms the State of Missouri. In 1817 the slave interest demanded that this should be admitted into the Union as a slave state. The general feeling was strongly against the extension of slavery to any new districts. Moreover, the free and slave states were then exactly equal in number, and (as each state elects two members to the Senate for the Union) the addition of a new slave state would give the slaveholding interest a clear majority. Besides this, the position of the district itself, lying between the free states and the wide world of the West, made its possession most important as a basis of future colonisation. As was to be expected, the proposal to add Missouri as an additional slave state to the Union was keenly contested, and as might also have been expected by any one who had observed the result of former struggles,* the South in the end attained its object. In 1820 was passed, by the consent of both parties, the celebrated law called in America "the Missouri Compromise," by which Missouri (which extends as far north as $40^{\circ} 30'$) was admitted into the Union as a slave state, upon condition that slavery should for ever be excluded from every other part of the territory ceded by France lying north of $36^{\circ} 30'$ north latitude. What the South gained by this (besides the most important possession of Missouri itself) was, that the great region now forming the State of Arkansas was set apart for settlement by slaves; what it gave up was practically the claim to form slave states in Kansas and Nebraska; for the remainder of the French province was unsuited for slave cultivation. This measure "was brought forward by a slaveholder, vindicated by slaveholders in debate, and upheld at the time by the essential approbation of slaveholding President James Munro and his Cabinet, of whom a majority

Missouri compromise, of which we are now speaking, and which was made in 1820, had of course no reference to these districts. It related merely to those ceded by France in 1803.

* Mr. Stevens (now Vice-President of the Confederate States) was a member of the United States Congress in 1854, and in a debate on this very subject, thus addressed the Northern members:—"Well, gentlemen, you make a good deal of clamour over this Kansas affair, but it don't alarm us. You have often *threatened*, but you have never *performed*. You always *caved in*, and you will do so again. We *have got you in our power*. You *must submit to the yoke*. Don't be so impatient as to complain; you will only be *slapped in the face*. Don't resist; you will only be *lashed into obedience*." He was not speaking without strong grounds, though happily his expectations have been frustrated.

were slaveholders, including Mr. Calhoun himself,"* and reluctantly conceded by the North. It was felt by all parties to be a most important victory for the slave interest, and as a matter of fact, its effect was that from 1820 till 1860 the slave interest, almost without an interruption, dictated the whole internal and external policy of the United States. In virtue of this agreement Arkansas was admitted to the Union as a slave state in 1836.

The South had now nothing more to gain by the Missouri compromise, for the whole district south of the fixed limit was occupied by slave states. The leaders, therefore, resolved to repudiate the agreement of which they had received the whole benefit, and to appropriate Kansas and Nebraska, the chance of obtaining which was the only thing they had given up as their part of the compromise. Now, therefore, it was declared that the law in question was "unconstitutional," and that Congress had exceeded its powers in excluding slavery from this territory. A new law, the "Kansas and Nebraska Act," introduced by Mr. Douglas who (himself a Northern man) was a leading member of the slavery party, and its candidate for the Presidency, was pushed forward by the whole strength of the party, and passed in 1854. It enacted that every state to be afterwards admitted should decide for itself, by the free vote of its inhabitants at the time of its admission, whether or not slavery should be admitted into it. This rule is called in America "*Squatter Sovereignty*."†

The "Missouri compromise" being thus disposed of, it remained only to apply the new principle to the case of Kansas. In that, however, there were difficulties enough to have discouraged less able or more scrupulous men. First, the decision was to be made by the inhabitants of Kansas, and a great majority of these were at the time notoriously known, and are now admitted to have been against the introduction of slavery. That, however, mattered little. All the officials of the territory were at the nomination of the President, an out and out friend to slavery, subject to the approval of the Senate, in which the slave interest commanded a large majority. The support of all the officials and returning officers was thus

* These words are quoted by Professor Cairnes from the speech of Mr. Sumner in the Senate of the United States.

† Settlers in the backwoods are called squatters. They take what unoccupied lands they please, and have by law a "right of preemption" when the Government puts them up for sale. As soon as such settlers in any territory have attained a certain fixed number it may be admitted as a state. The new law, therefore, gave the power of deciding the constitution of the future state to these "squatters."

secured—under these circumstances, to obtain a majority of votes was easy. Kansas borders on the state of Missouri, in which (as in every slave state) there is a large number of what are called in America “Mean whites,” men who despise regular labour as the badge of slavery, and spend in poverty a lawless life, between that of a sportsman and a bandit. It is among these that the filibusters who have several times attacked Cuba, Central America, &c., have been recruited. Bands of these men regularly organized, crossed the border in arms whenever an election was to be held in Kansas, drove from the ballot the legal voters, and elected strong partizans of slavery. So openly was this done that among many other instances, at a place called Oxford, which had altogether forty-two votes, one thousand votes were registered on behalf of slavery; at Shawnee, which had only forty inhabitants, twelve hundred votes. The legislature thus elected proceeded to frame a constitution, in the name, and by the authority, of a population strongly opposed to slavery. Not only was slavery legally established in Kansas, but the whole slave code of Missouri (not remarkably mild) was adopted in the gross. It was not, however, thought sufficiently severe for the due preservation of the “peculiar institution” (as slavery is tenderly termed in the Southern States), and was enriched by a number of enactments for the special benefit of Kansas. By these, all persons were required to disclaim by oath sentiments unfavourable to slavery before voting in any election. Any white man who would take this oath, and another which bound him to maintain and uphold the “fugitive slave law” and the “Nebraska Act” (which abolished the “Missouri compromise,” and threw open to slavery all the territories of the Union) was qualified to vote by paying one dollar on the day of election, although he had never resided in the state. As the only inhabited district bordering on Kansas is the slave state of Missouri—the population of which is much greater, as it has been a state since 1820—this law practically threw all elections into the hands of the Missouri filibusters. The maintenance of anti-slavery opinions was made felony. The penalty of death was enacted in this precious code by no less than forty-eight different laws against acts tending to injure slave institutions, such as assisting in the escape of a slave, &c. This code, such as it was in itself, and carried as it was, could not become law until it had been approved by the President of the United States (for Kansas was not yet a state); that, however, was given at once and without hesitation, for Mr. President Pierce (though born in a free state) was a zealous partizan of the slave interest, and Mr. Jefferson Davis, the present President of the Confederate

States, and other leaders in the secession, were his ministers. On the spot the "Constitution" was maintained by the same system of lawless violence by which it had been originally carried. Thus, an English gentleman who visited the state at this time says: "In one instance a man belonging to General Atkinson's camp made a bet of six dollars against a pair of boots, that he would go and return with an abolitionist's scalp within two hours. He went forth on horseback. Before he had got two miles he met a Mr. Hops, a gentleman of high respectability, returning from Lawrence, where he had left his wife sick. Mr. Hops was asked whence he came, and on his replying from Lawrence, was at once shot through the head. The ruffian then returned to Leavenworth, and paraded the streets with the bleeding scalp of the murdered man on a pole. Eight days later, the widow came with her brother (the Rev. Mr. Nute, of Boston, a minister at Lawrence), to recover the body. The whole party was seized, robbed of all they had, and placed in confinement. Next day one was shot for attempting to escape. The widow and one or two others were allowed to depart by steamer, but penniless. A German, incautiously condemning the outrage, was shot; and another saved his life only by precipitate flight."* Professor Cairnes quotes another case, in which eleven settlers from the North were shot at one time by an armed force, "the only crime charged against them being that of being free-state men," and nothing was done "either by the President of the United States, the Governor of Missouri, the Governor of Kansas, or any member of the Administration, to punish the outrage."

By these means was slavery declared to be legally established in Kansas in 1855, and by these means it was confidently expected by the leaders of the slaveholding party, and by the government of Washington, which then was, and had for years been, in the closest union with them, that it would permanently remain so. Their error, as we have seen, was, that they did not calculate upon the indignation which these things were sure to kindle in a country in which publicity was as great as in England itself. To forget this was worse than a crime; it was a gross blunder, and has been fatal to their power. The news was daily published in detail in the papers of every Northern town, and the conviction was brought home to every man, that the government of the United States, not content with protecting slavery where it existed (which was its official duty), was in a conspiracy with the Southern leaders

* See "Kansas; or, Squatter Life and Border Warfare in the far West." By T. K. Gladstone. We have a little shortened the extract.

to extend it to districts where it had never existed, and in which it was earnestly repudiated by the mass of the inhabitants, in whom the decision of the question was vested by law ; and, moreover, that for this purpose the government of the Union did not hesitate to connive at and even to authorise any perfidy, any violence, any atrocity.

This universal conviction produced two great results. One was immediate. The *bonâ fide* settlers in Kansas, finding themselves trampled upon by armed banditti, and betrayed by the government whose duty it was to protect them, rose in arms to defend themselves. All the chances seemed against them ; for their oppressors had only to cross the border from the adjoining state of Missouri, in order to pour in reinforcements in abundance ; and, moreover, had the hearty support of the few Federal troops stationed in the territory. But the regular settlers had an advantage which, as the result proved, far outweighed all these. They were chiefly the younger members of families belonging to the sturdy race of New England farmers, a class in which are to be found many of the finest and most manly specimens of the English race, although not free from the unhappy taint of an hereditary Puritanism. In accordance with the national custom, they had gone some twelve or fourteen hundred miles to bring into subjection a new wilderness ; but their kinsmen and friends were not likely to sit still by their firesides, when the news reached their native villages that they were being oppressed and slaughtered, in open defiance equally of justice and of law, with the connivance of a government sworn to defend them. From many a pleasant rustic homestead in Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire, came forth sturdy yeomen with guns in hand and revolvers at their girdle : and not to mention other states, they were joined by enthusiastic students from the colleges of Massachusetts and Connecticut. An irregular civil war followed, the fortunes of which we have not time to relate. But a movement had begun which the whole force of the South could not have put down. For several years Kansas had two rival governments, one supported by those worthy allies, the government at Washington, and the filibusters of Missouri ; the other by the free settlers and their friends. Both sides made their voice heard in the Senate and House of Representatives of the Union. It was while urging the right of Kansas to admission as a free state that Mr. Sumner, the Senator from Connecticut, was beaten almost to death by a Southern Senator, the Honourable Preston Brooks, who was addressed and *fêted* for his cowardly assault on an unarmed old man by the cities of the slave states. The dispute lasted for

years, for it was not until after the election of Mr. Lincoln that Kansas was admitted into the Union as a free state.

Meanwhile the reaction extended far beyond the immediate affair. Its great result was the formation of the "Free-soil" or republican party, by which the United States are now governed. The "democratical party," which, in consequence of its close union with the leaders of the South, and by their support, had held almost uninterrupted possession of the administration ever since 1820, had grossly betrayed its trust. Multitudes who had always supported it combined with its old opponents to eject it. Its old opponents laid aside for the same purpose their old party names and party combinations. A manifesto was issued by a great meeting of the new party, held in Philadelphia, on the 18th of June, 1856, which declared its principles. It disavowed any intention of interfering with slavery in any state in which it was already established. But it declared against its introduction into any territory of the United States; that is, it assailed, not the existence, but the further extension of slavery. It adopted what are called in America "Free-soil" principles. The election of a President immediately followed. Although the party was as yet hardly constituted, its candidate (Mr. Fremont) was nearly successful: and from that time all men anticipated its complete success at the next election in November, 1860.

To make sweeping assertions is considerably easier than to answer them in detail. We do not see that anything could have been omitted from our statement of the circumstances which called into existence the "Republican party," yet it has filled several pages. Lord Lothian's explanation of the same event is much shorter. He tells us it was merely the result of a cabal for the election of a President. For this purpose a party in the North raised a cry against Irish Catholics, in which they expected that the Southern gentlemen would be induced to join. This was refused.

The astonishment of the wire-pullers of the party was probably very great. But they did not lose their presence of mind. Their course was perfectly clear. If the Southern states were so foolish as not to see what was for their advantage, and declined to join this crusade against foreign Papists, why, the foreign Papists must be induced to join a crusade against them, and every effort was made to induce the foreign Papists to do so. Unfortunately, the Irish did not follow the same course that the Southerners had done. They were either not generous or not clear-sighted enough to do so. The "American party," without one word of compunction, or without one feeling of shame, dropped its colours at once, and hoisted those of the Free-soil party; thus originated the great Republican party.

Such a way of accounting for some of the gravest events in the history of the world is little better than childish. Yet we do not know that any theory much more plausible could be made for a man who, like Lord Lothian, is resolved to believe that slavery was not the real cause of the late events in America. Space forbids (what would else be easy enough) that we should refute in detail the mass of his assertions. All the facts have been carefully misrepresented to him. Take any sample. He says that the North repudiated the "Missouri compromise;" and this he explains (page 123) by saying that "they carried through Congress a bill for the prohibition of slavery in the state of California." No doubt California is a free state, the greater part of which lies south of $36^{\circ} 30'$. But with California the Missouri compromise had nothing to do. That law was expressly limited to the province ceded by France, and California was no part of that province but was part of the territory taken by force from Mexico. Next, Congress neither passed, nor was it ever asked to pass, with regard to California, any such bill as the author imagines. California, no doubt, was originally intended by the Southern leaders to be a slave state. They were disappointed, not by any measure in Congress, but by the unexpected discovery of gold. The rush which immediately took place, not from the United States alone, but from England and all Europe,* changed all its prospects. By the ordinary law of the United States this multitude of settlers had the right to adopt a constitution for themselves, and had this not been the case, it is very certain that, placed where they were, at the other side of a huge continent, not the whole naval and military force of the United States would have availed to force one upon them. This one circumstance, to say nothing of their numbers, would alone have made it impossible to overpower them by incursions of filibusters in the manner soon afterwards adopted in Kansas. Now the settlers, of whom probably not one in a thousand came from the slave states, decided very positively for themselves that slaves they would not admit. This single fact settled the question without the necessity of any act of Congress. Congress would have found it pretty nearly as easy to found by legislative enactments a slave colony in the moon, as in California. To do them justice, the Southern leaders never thought of proposing that slavery

* The population was, in 1790, 7,748 ; in 1851, 215,000 ; in 1859, 538,000. Thus it had more than doubled in eight years. Among the population, there were 25,000 French, 25,000 Germans, 20,000 Spanish, besides Americans and English.

should be forced upon California. It had settled that question for itself. What they demanded was, that under these circumstances, and solely on that one ground, it should not be allowed to become a state at all. For a time they resisted this with success, for this was a matter which Congress could control. At last, in 1850, they consented to another "compromise," by which it was admitted as a free state on condition that the "fugitive slave law" (which Lord Lothian imagines to have been unanimously adopted in 1789)* should be carried through Congress.

But it is time to leave these details. It is more important to notice the fallacy which lies at the root of this whole theory, because, unfortunately, it is but too prevalent in England, and there seems real danger lest our country should be misled, without intending it, into the misery of interfering on behalf of wrong and injustice, chiefly owing to this general misunderstanding of the facts, partly (we are compelled to add) by the wicked and senseless endeavours of Mr. Seward and others to stir up a causeless quarrel between two great nations which have in truth the same interests, and which ought to love and honour each other the more, because, however separated, they are still fundamentally one people.† The

* It was enacted in 1789, that slaves escaping into any other state should be given up. The law of 1850, however, provided a new machinery for the execution of this principle, and practically inaugurated a wholly new system. It is to this that the name "fugitive slave law" belongs.

† Would that we could impress upon our friends in America the weighty and truthful words with which Mr. Goldwin Smith took his leave of America, "with one foot as it were on the deck of an English vessel," "Let me presume, with all deference, to offer you a single word of advice, in case occasion should ever arise in regard to your method of dealing in controverted matters with the English nation. Englishmen unfortunately have some qualities which are not calculated to make them popular among other nations; and perhaps their popularity among their European rivals has not been increased by that which seldom does increase popularity—a somewhat disproportionate amount of success. But as a nation they are not regardless, perhaps they are more regardful, than most other nations of justice and honour. If England has done you, if ever she should hereafter do you a wrong, approach her as one man of honour would approach another by whom he felt that he had been aggrieved, with a frank, manly, and courteous request for reparation; but without acrimony, or petulance, or angry imputation of motives, which can lead to no practical result, and which, after all, may be undeserved. Depend upon it, your application, made in this spirit, will meet with no ungenerous response, even though compliance with it should be difficult and onerous; and there will be many in England who will esteem it their highest duty to their country to second a fair claim courteously preferred, to the extent of their power. And oh! persuade your government, if you can, to exercise a due control over the language of its subordinates, and not to suffer questions, a wrong solution of which may entail wretched calamities on two nations, and on the world, to be prejudiced by any one who has not to bear the full

fallacy is to imagine that the late secession was brought on by a series of encroachments made by the North upon the rights and interests of the South. The fact is, that almost ever since the Union the South, under the guidance of able statesmen, has directed the internal and external policy of the Union,* and has directed them with true oligarchical skill and foresight to the attainment of a single end,—the maintenance and extension of negro slavery.

For eighty years, from 1780 to 1860, the statesmen of the South made the Union their tool for accomplishing this object. They worked it with a success which is truly wonderful, and which only once failed them. The result is, that the number of slaves has increased from 677,533 to 4,000,000, and the territory devoted to slavery has been multiplied several times over: and all this in a country in which, eighty years ago, all men of all parties agreed that slavery was an evil and a

responsibility of the result. One word more: You know that no syllable, even of hypothetical hostility, much less of menace to America, would ever pass my lips; but I ought not to permit any American to be misled by anything that has fallen from me, or from more influential writers and speakers, as to the division of sentiment which prevails among Englishmen as to the American question, and which it is necessary to explain, lest you should suppose that the whole body of the English people is animated by the hostility towards America expressed by such organs of mere class feeling as the *Times*. If any dominant class or party in England were to attempt to use the power of the State for the purpose of doing you a wrong, we should be divided, and you would have a zealous and, as I think, not an insignificant party on your side. But let the honour of England be touched, and we are a united nation." For our own part, fully persuaded as we are that in the present war the North is substantially fighting in the cause of justice and right, nothing could be more deeply grievous than that our country should take any part against this cause. But there is real danger lest the British government should feel so sure that, do what it will, a war will be forced upon it, as to consider whether it may not be better that it should take place while the aggressors have their hands occupied by other enemies.

* Professor Cairnes (p. 102) quotes the following passage from the *Louisville Courier*. It curiously contrasts with the relation of the Southern States to the North, as described by Lord Lothian:—"As our Norman kinsmen in England, always a minority, have ruled their Saxon countrymen in political vassalage up to the present day, so have we, the slave oligarchs, governed the Yankees till within a twelvemonth. We passed the constitution, for seventy years moulded the policy of government, and placed our own men, or 'Northern men with Southern principles,' in power. On the 6th of November, 1860, the Puritans emancipated themselves, and are now in violent insurrection against their former owners. This insane holiday freak, however, will not last long, for dastards in fight, and incapable of self-government, they will inevitably again fall under the control of a superior race. A few more Bull Run thrashings will bring them once more under the yoke as docile as the most loyal of our Ethiopian chattels." As to the past relation between the two, this statement is correct enough.

scandal of which they were resolved to rid themselves as soon as possible, and the immediate abolition of which was postponed only by a single vote. It is a memorable example of the control which a few able men proposing to themselves a single object and keeping it steadily before their eyes, are able to exercise over multitudes who are diverted by the passions of the moment, first to one object, then to another. By their influence and for their ends Texas was obtained by a course of shameless trickery and violence, which was felt and declared by the most high-minded Americans to be an indelible stain upon the character of their country. For them an unjust war of aggression was waged against Mexico, by which vast territories, from which by Mexican law slavery had for ever been banished, were added to its domain. For them a system of filibustering invasions of Cuba and Central America was encouraged by the Federal Government. For them the laws which denounced the African slave trade were habitually and systematically set at naught. In all these things, and many more, the Federal Government and the whole power of all the states were made the tools of an unscrupulous minority, which, having no other object at heart except the interests of slavery, was always able to turn the balance between the two great political parties, which were always pretty equal in the Northern States, and so to secure the possession of power to that party which consented to become its tool. By that party the enormous patronage of the Federal Government has steadily been exercised, under many successive Presidents, on behalf of the slave interest.* For many a year the

* Lord Lothian has been led to believe that "the patronage of the Union is almost entirely given to Northerners." Such vague assertions hardly deserve an answer. It is notorious, as we pointed out a year ago, that "in the last seventy-two years there have been eighteen elections and re-elections of Presidents, of which twelve have returned slaveholders, and only six Northern men. Twenty-three Southern Secretaries of State have held office together during forty years; nine men from the free states have held office during twenty-nine years. Only three Presidents since 1809 have been Northern men, and in almost every instance even these Northern men have owed their election to a Southern vote, and have been decided in their support of Southern interests"—(DUBLIN REVIEW, April, 1864, p. 339). On this subject Mr. Stevens (now Vice-President of "the Confederate States") said in the Georgia Convention of 1861:—"We have had a majority of the Presidents chosen from the South, as well as the control and management of most of those chosen from the North. We have had sixty years of Southern Presidents to their twenty-four, thus controlling the Executive department. So of the judges of the Supreme Court, we have had eighteen from the South, and but eleven from the North; although nearly four-fifths of the judicial business has arisen in the Free States, yet a majority of the Court has always been from the South. This we have required, so as to guard

Union has done good service to slavery—so much so, that men well acquainted with the subject refused to believe that the threats of secession, used to prevent Mr. Lincoln's election, could really be serious. They underestimated the boldness of the policy as much as events have shown that they underestimated the military courage and power of the Southern leaders. Both one and the other, if employed in a better cause, would justly have been worthy of all admiration. Those leaders, indeed, like everyone else, were taken by surprise, and did not anticipate the tremendous nature of the struggle into which they were throwing themselves. They expected that the secession would be accomplished without any serious war, and that, if war did ensue, it would speedily terminate in their own favour. Nor were these expectations without strong foundation. The Federal Government was almost wholly without army or navy, and no one supposed that a people so long exclusively devoted to the acquisition of wealth would readily burden itself with the cost of a protracted war. It is now known, and could have been no secret from them, that several of the leading members of Mr. Buchanan's

against any interpretation of the Constitution unfavourable to us. In like manner we have been equally watchful to guard our interests in the Legislative branch of government. In choosing the presiding Presidents (*pro tem.*) of the Senate, we have had twenty-four to their eleven. Speakers of the House, we have had twenty-three, and they twelve. While the majority of the Representatives, from their greater population, have always been from the North, yet we have so generally secured the Speaker, because he, to a great extent, shapes and controls the legislation of the country. Nor have we had less control in every other department of the general government. Attorney-generals we have had fourteen, while the North have had but five. Foreign ministers, we have had eighty-six, and they but fifty-four. While three-fourths of the business which demands diplomatic agents abroad is clearly from the Free States, from their greater commercial interests, yet we have had the principal embassies, so as to secure the world markets for our cotton, tobacco, and sugar, on the best possible terms. We have had a vast majority of the higher offices of both army and navy, while a larger proportion of the soldiers and sailors were drawn from the North. Equally so of clerks, auditors, and comptrollers filling the Executive department; the records show for the last fifty years that, of the three thousand thus employed, we have had more than two-thirds of the same, while we have but one-third of the white population of the Republic." On the whole Esau seems tolerably well able to look after his own interests. The only fact to which Lord Lothian can refer on the other side, is that the chief expenditure on lighthouses has been on the Northern coasts. How could it be otherwise when, as he himself elsewhere says, all the shipping interest was in the North? The single small state of Maine built more vessels in a year than all the slave states together. Are not lights more needed at the mouth of the Thames than on the coasts of Melville Island? The cause of this remarkable difference is no mystery, but we must not now enter upon it. The fact alone is necessary to our purpose.

administration (whether with or without his own knowledge) had treacherously prepared for the secession* by moving almost all the military stores belonging to the Union into depôts in the Southern states, which fell at once into the hands of the Seceders. In addition to all this it was well known to the Southern leaders that the Abolitionist party in the North had for years desired to be rid of the Union, which gave to the cause of slavery the whole support of all the United States, and which on that ground it denounced as a "covenant with hell."† Lastly, they confidently reckoned that England and France would interfere to prevent the blockade of the Southern ports, and thus put a speedy end to the war.

It is certain, therefore, that the terrible nature of the struggle before them was as little foreseen by the Southern leaders as it notoriously was by the Northern States or by bystanders, who (while confident that the permanent conquest of the Southern States was impossible, if their inhabitants had made up their minds rather to suffer all extremities than to submit) based their calculations rather upon the extent and climate of the territory to be occupied than on the resistance which eight millions of white men, scattered over a region so vast and burdened with four millions of slaves, could possibly offer in the field. It is no imputation upon the courage and endurance of either party to question whether, if they had foreseen what was to come, they might not have declined the contest; for all history witnesses that the most heroic struggles have been undertaken by nations unconscious of what they were under-

* This has been openly avowed, since the secession took place, by Mr. Buchanan's Secretary at War, J. B. Floyd, who became a general in the Confederate service; as also did Mr. Breckenridge, Vice-President of the United States, and the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Cobb. The Secretary for the Interior became Governor of Mississippi. No wonder such men prepared for secession, while professing to serve the United States.

† Mr. Garrison, the president of the Anti-slavery Society, publicly burned the "Constitution of the United States," on the day (July 4) devoted by American patriotism to the laudation of themselves and their institutions, and the reviling of poor Old England. Lord Lothian complains (p. 108) :—"To keep up this covenant with hell, the denouncers have caused the slaughter of a million of human beings, and the destruction of half a continent." We by no means, of course, go the whole length with the Abolitionists, much as we admire their courage and perseverance. But any how, they are quite consistent. Before the secession, they saw that slavery was maintained by the Union. To secure its abolition, or even to clear their country from participation in it, they desired to sacrifice the Union. After the secession, they could not help seeing that the independence of the South, on the terms demanded by the Southern leaders, would have secured the perpetuity and the unlimited extension of slavery. Therefore they resisted it.

taking. Such was that of the Roman people against Carthage, and that of the English nation against Napoleon. But we are inclined to believe that the Southern leaders at least were deliberately prepared to risk or suffer anything rather than submit to the new system which had been inaugurated by the success of the Free-soil party, because the acceptance of it would have implied the abandonment, not of any temporary desire, but of schemes which they and their fathers had been pursuing with great talent and perseverance for more than seventy years. That they had long found the Union a most powerful weapon in their own hands was no reason why they should permit it to be wielded by the hands of their determined opponents. From the Union they had nothing more to hope; from Secession, if once successfully accomplished, they expected confidently, and as it would seem on good grounds, to gain everything.

What their hopes were we are told by the ablest of their advocates in England:—"An empire of the future, extending from the home of Washington to the ancient palaces of Montezuma, uniting the proud colonies of England with Spain's richest and most romantic dominions, the productions of the great valley of the Mississippi with the mineral riches, the magical beauty, the volcanic grandeur of Mexico."*

All these hopes the Southern leaders must have surrendered if they had consented to remain in the Union, in the position to which they had been reduced by the success of the Free-soil party—as a minority entitled indeed to its protection, but no longer directing its counsels. Separation upon any terms to which they looked forward as possible—nay, we firmly believe, upon any which even now, after all they have suffered, and in their extremest danger, they would be prepared to accept, would leave them in a position to seize with their own hands all they had ever hoped for.

For the separation which they demanded, and which for many months the Federal Government was ready to concede, until the roar of the cannon before Fort Sumter roused the indignation of the whole people, and kindled the fire which now wraps a whole continent, would have left them in possession of all that were already constituted as slave states, and of an enormous proportion of the unsettled territories, which by their climate invited slave cultivation. That a society constituted like that which now exists in the Southern States, has a remarkable aptitude for war, can hardly be doubted if we consider the strength which those states have shown during

* Mr. Spence, the well-known writer in the *Times*, under the signature "S."

the dreadful war of the last four years, confronted, as they have been, not only against the millions and the great wealth of the free states, and against a navy absolutely mistress of the seas, but against a vast annual immigration from Europe. We need hardly say, then, that long before Arkansas, Texas, New Mexico, and the other Southern territories had been filled up, the slave confederation would have been in a position to take just as much as it pleased, and when it pleased, from Mexico and Central America.

There may be those who think that many years, or even many generations, would have elapsed before districts which would have absorbed at least eight or ten millions of additional slaves could have been thus settled. Such, no doubt, would have been the case if the Confederate States had been compelled to depend upon the natural increase of their existing slaves. It would be a poor compliment to the foresight of the able men who direct their councils, to suppose that they were insensible to this. They had deliberately looked forward to it, and had made up their minds that, when secession was once accomplished, only one thing more would be needed to the accomplishment of all their golden hopes. That one thing secession put into their own hands the power of taking when they pleased, for that one thing was the legal restoration of the African slave trade. To this, after the election of Mr. Lincoln, they could hardly hope that the Congress of the Union would accede. But, once a recognized and independent Republic, and it would rest merely with themselves to resume it when they pleased. It is certain that they had made up their minds to resume it; and it can hardly be doubted that this resolution was one at least of their main motives for resolving upon secession.

We are aware that to many persons in England the restoration of the African slave trade on a large scale by the Confederate States will seem chimerical. And of course nothing has been said upon the subject by their European advocates. We are certain that it was not only contemplated but fully decided. Our space will enable us to give only an outline of the grounds of our conviction. But we can hardly imagine that any fair man can dispassionately examine the evidence produced by Professor Cairnes (pages 237 to 246, and pages 282 to 297), without coming to the same conclusion.

To suppose that the Southern leaders would have been deterred from the restoration of the slave trade by any scruples of their own would have been absurd, even if they had not, as we shall show, expressly protested that they had no scruples of the sort. How should they? They have always declared,

and still declare, that of all events which could happen to an African, the most blessed is to be made a slave in America. Apart from their own interest, they would therefore regard the restoration of the trade as a great act of charity. It is singularly happy when a nation sees its way to wealth, magnificence, and empire, through acts of such large beneficence.

But could they expect that the European powers, and especially England, would allow the slave trade to be thus developed?

This they had also well considered, and the result at which they had arrived is set forth in a very remarkable letter, entitled "*The Philosophy of Secession*," and addressed by the Honourable L. W. Spratt, of South Carolina, to the Honourable J. Perkins, of Louisiana—"all honourable men." He answers that the professed enmity of England and France to slavery and the slave trade was partly a mere fashion and partly a political pretence. They were jealous of the power which the United States obtained by means of slavery in the South, because the Northern States were, in many ways, their rivals: "on the contrary, if the South were to stand out for itself, free from the control of any other power, and were to offer to European States, on fair terms, a full supply of its commodities, she would not only not be warred upon, but singularly favoured—crowns would bend before her; kingdoms and empires would break a lance to win the smile of her approval." "There is a mode upon the subject of human rights at present; and England, France, and other States that are the leaders of the mode, might be pleased to see the South comply with the standard of requirement: and, provided that no serious inconvenience or injury resulted, would be pleased to see the South suppress not only the slave trade, but slavery itself. But will our failure to do so make any difference in our relations with those States? . . . As they have no repugnance to slavery in accordance with their interests, so they can have none to the extension of it. They will submit to any terms of intercourse with the slave republic, in consideration of its markets and its products. An increase of slaves will increase the market and supply. They will pocket their philanthropy and the profits together." Mistaken as this gentleman is about the state of feeling in England, he is a sensible judge of what lies before his eyes. He wrote the paper before us as a protest against that article in the Constitution of the Confederate States, which declares the African slave trade illegal, while expressly preserving that with any of the late United States. His argument, as addressed to men who extol slavery, is unanswerable. Slavery without the slave trade, he says, is inconsistent. The

slave trade was abolished by our fathers, only because they (under a complete mistake) regarded slavery as an evil to be gradually got rid of. We have abandoned these delusions. When we allowed the slave trade to be abolished, we virtually "allowed slavery to be condemned and denounced. If the foreign slave trade had never been suppressed, slave society must have triumphed. It would have extended to the limits of New England. I regard the slave trade as the test of the integrity of our institution. If that be right, then slavery is right, but not otherwise. If we forego the slave trade in consideration of the moral feeling of the world, then why not slavery also? It were madness now to blink the question. We are entering at last on a daring innovation upon the social constitutions of the world. We are erecting a nationality upon a union of races" [*i. e.* one dominant and one enslaved] "where other nations have but one. We cannot dodge the issue. We cannot safely change our front in the face of a vigilant adversary." "I was the single advocate of the slave trade in 1853; it is now the question of the day. Many of us remember when we first heard slavery declared to be the normal constitution of society; few now will dare to disaffirm it. These opinions roll on. They are now not only true, but are coming to be trusted."

We have given, in the few extracts for which we have space, a very imperfect idea of an argument which seems to us unanswerable. It is printed entire by Professor Cairnes in his "Appendix," and is well worth study by any man who wishes to know the real springs of the secession movement. According to this writer the seeds of secession were sown when the African slave trade was abolished by the United States. He openly declares that if the Confederate States refuse to restore it they will be laying the seeds of a future revolution, to be made for its restoration.

But it would be great injustice to the able men who conducted the secession, to suppose that they were blind to the one condition absolutely necessary to the success of their own plans. It is true the constitution adopted by them forbids the African slave trade, and charges the Legislature to enact penalties against it. But it is equally certain that this prohibition is merely illusory. The Confederate leaders never thought of doing more than Spain has already done. Mr. Spratt says, in the same paper, "Spain permits the trade in Cuba, though she acknowledges the mode (*i. e.* the fashion of pretending to condemn it) by professing to prohibit it." But there was no need to look over the Atlantic. Mr. Jefferson Davis had for years held high office at Washington, and he

well knew that the Federal Government has all along done the same thing. The slave trade was made piracy by the United States in 1813. It has notoriously been carried on ever since by merchants at New York and other Northern ports; and never till after the commencement of the present war was anything done to prevent it. Under President Buchanan it was carried on openly and avowedly. Five years ago newspapers published in South Carolina and Georgia used as publicly to announce the arrival of cargoes of negroes as the *Times* published the arrival of Australian gold at the Bank.* The *Augusta Chronicle*, December 16, says: "About 270 of the cargo of the 'Wanderer' are now on a plantation in South Carolina, two or three miles below this city, on the Savannah river, and we suppose will now be offered for sale." The *Augusta Dispatch* says: "We learn, on good authority, that the cargo consisted of 420. . . . Citizens of our city are probably interested in the enterprise. It is hinted that this is the third cargo landed by the same company during the last six months. . . . One of our citizens has bought from the lot a stout boy about fourteen years old for 250 dollars. To show what practical good can result from the agitation of the revival of the slave trade, we point to this cargo of sturdy labourers delivered from the darkness and barbarism of Africa to be elevated and Christianized on our soil, and to the price paid for this son of the jungle, compared with the exorbitant prices paid for less valuable negroes here; and we claim that these results are the beginning of the blessings to flow in upon the South from that agitation." In Georgia, about the same time, an agricultural society offered "a premium of twenty-five dollars for the best specimen of a live African imported within the last twelve months, to be exhibited at the next meeting of the society." Several other instances are given by Professor Cairnes. In one instance information was sent to the authorities. At this time, it is to be remembered that the Union was in full force, and President Buchanan (who had for some years before resided in London as Minister of the United States, and who was himself a Northern man, though of Southern politics) was in office at Washington; and that by the laws which he had sworn to maintain and execute, slave-trading was a capital offence. What then was done? The United States attorney and the Marshal had notice of the proceedings, but declined to interfere, the latter expressly disclaiming any right to detain the Africans. A Deputy-Marshal, in Telfair County, arrested thirty-six on their way to Alabama, in charge

* We quote from the Appendix (L) to Professor Cairnes' "Slave Power."

of one or two men, put them in the county gaol, and reported to the Marshal at Savannah what he had done. The Marshal replied that "he had telegraphed and written to the authorities at Washington, and had received no answer, respecting the Africans known to be in the county; and his advice was to turn them loose and let them go on their way." The deputy did so; the persons from whom they had been taken resumed the charge of them, and pursued their journey. We need hardly say that while the slave-owners were in power for so many years at Washington, slave ships were practically not taken, although the United States had undertaken by treaty with Great Britain to maintain on the African coast a squadron sufficient effectually to prevent the trade. The common inference was that it was prevented.* In fact, it was well known to everybody in New York that it was in active operation. Newspapers in the Northern States published even the names of the houses known to be carrying it on. How the guard on the African coast was kept we are told in the *Edinburgh Review* for October, 1860: "Large vessels were sent, which could not go near the shore while occupying the beat, and permitting no cruiser of a more serviceable size to go where they could be useful. From the Congo River alone 1,000 negroes per month were carried off, under cover of the American flag." Meanwhile the ships were allowed to be holiday-making at Madeira, the Canaries, the Cape de Verdes, and St. Helena. Upright officers were glad to avoid a service in which their instructions were so vague and their action so restricted as to stultify their position. This was in 1859; and a few months afterwards Mr. Secretary Cass wrote a celebrated letter to the Minister of the United States in London, denying the existence of the trade, and pointing out especially that the penalty for it was death, but forgetting to mention that the penalty had never in any solitary instance been inflicted.

Under such circumstances, the wonder is that any American slave ship was taken by an American cruiser; and by those of no other nation could they be taken, because the American Government, standing on their right, refused to allow it. Strange to say, by some accident, two or three were actually captured, and neither owners nor commanders were punished. We suspect that the naval officers who took them were in more danger from the Washington authorities than their prisoners.

* Professor Cairnes quotes the *Saturday Review*, Oct. 18, 1862, which declares that not one hundred Africans have, since 1808, been landed on the Southern coast.

But what of the negroes? One cargo of negroes at least was taken to Key West, and detained there a considerable time, professedly waiting for means of sending them to Africa. It was soon reported that they were dying very fast, and many coffins were daily brought ashore for burial. "But it has oozed out that, though many may have died, the greater number of coffins interred were empty, representing negroes who were not dead or sick, but learning cotton cultivation in the interior" (p. 563).

Be it observed that this was the way in which the slave trade was suppressed by a government which represented the Northern as well as the Southern States, and upon which, therefore, were fixed the eyes of the Abolitionists. And all this was perfectly well known to those who drew up the constitution of the Confederate States. They knew also that whatever laws they enacted, the slave trade would depend for its existence upon a government which represented merely the slave states, in which an Abolitionist would be considerably less safe than a mad dog in Cheapside. Well might they feel that any law which it was convenient to enact against the slave trade would be merely illusory; and yet so scrupulous was the Confederate Congress in its dealings with the subject, that instead of making it a capital offence, as it was before the Disunion, it has limited the penalty to the confiscation of the vessel seized.

Moreover, supposing England or France to recognize the independence of the South, from that hour they abandon all right to interfere in the matter.* The Confederate States may refuse to take any means whatever to enforce this prohi-

* It is important to bear in mind that no ship has any right to stop a slaver belonging to any other nation, except such seizing is authorized by a treaty with the government of the nation to which it belongs. Such a treaty the United States have made with us since the commencement of the present war, having always before refused to do so because our cruisers would have interfered practically with the trade which the Government of Washington, while disavowing, was really encouraging. Nothing was more painful to humane British officers than to examine a vessel on the high seas, to find it crowded with several hundreds of slaves rapidly sinking under the horrors of the middle passage, and then to be obliged to let it go on its way unchecked on its being found to have American papers. The writer of this article five and thirty years ago heard these scenes described by a gallant British captain as being then of frequent occurrence. In the summer and autumn of 1857, not less than twenty-two vessels were thus captured by English cruisers, of which "all but one were American, and the larger number belonged to New York" (*See Cairnes, 244*). It is certain that these scenes will be renewed as soon as the blockade of the Southern ports is opened, if the Confederate States are recognized as independent. Should they have time and opportunity to legalize the trade, of course it will be carried on on a larger scale.

bition, or they may, whenever they please, avowedly repeal it and throw open the trade. No foreign power would have any right to interfere. These things were perfectly well known to the leaders of the South. They knew that to avow that the renewal and development of the slave trade was the real object of their secession would be imprudent. For their great object at that moment was to engage Virginia and the other border states in the secession, and the opening of the African slave trade would deprive these states of their main inducement to secede, by destroying the monopoly by which they were making immense profits. Besides this, their confident expectation was that England would be compelled to interfere ("Cotton is King" was their fundamental maxim), and although they had no idea of the depth and intensity of the feeling in England upon slavery and the slave trade, they could not help seeing the importance of enabling her to do so without apparent inconsistency. Hence it is that, as we see, their agents in England still find it worth while to pretend that the real cause of secession is to be found in the tariff question. They are well aware that in England, free trade is nearly as much valued as slavery and the slave trade are detested. How successfully this delusion is still worked, Lord Lothian's marvellous volume is a striking proof.

In the slave states themselves this concealment is needless, and accordingly we can declare from a pretty extensive experience, that no one there even pretends to believe that either free trade or any other question except that of slavery had anything to do with the secession. Neither are much more pains taken to conceal what is really intended about the slave trade. We have seen what has been published by a South Carolina legislator. Another, equally dignified, the Honourable Andrew Hamilton, of Texas, writes, "Mr. Spratt's essay has been reproduced in the leading prints of the South, and spoken of in terms of commendation; and up to this time no man has lifted his voice in criticism against any of the positions there assumed. I have heard the echoes of these sentiments in the streets, in the hotels, and at the festive board."

But the "honourable gentleman" might have heard the echo from higher quarters. Professor Cairnes (p. 242) shows that Mr. Stevens, the actual Vice-President of the Confederate States, said, even before the secession took place, "We can divide Texas into five slave states, and get Chihuahua, Sonora, &c., if we have the slave population, and it is plain that unless the number of African stock be increased, we have not the population, and might as well abandon the race with our

brethren of the North in the colonization of the territories; slave states cannot be made without Africans. *I am not telling you to do it (i.e., Pray do not pump upon him, or duck him in the horse-pond).* "But it is a serious question concerning our political and domestic policy; and it is useless to wage war about abstract rights, or to quarrel and accuse each other of unsoundness, unless we get more Africans. *Negro slavery is but in its infancy.*"

But we may go higher still. President Jefferson Davis was against the opening of the slave trade in Mississippi, owing to the large number of slaves already in the state, and in expressing this opinion he said that he earnestly disclaimed "any coincidence of opinion with those who prate of the inhumanity and sinfulness of the trade. The interest of Mississippi, not of the African, dictates my conclusion. Her arm is no doubt strengthened by the presence of a due proportion of the servile caste, but it might be paralyzed by such an influx as would probably follow, if the gates of the African slave market were thrown open. This conclusion in relation to Mississippi is based upon my view of her present condition, not upon any general theory. *It is not supposed to be applicable to Texas, to New Mexico, or to any future acquisitions to be made south of the Rio Grande.*"

There is something exquisitely characteristic in the matter-of-fact manner in which both these gentlemen discuss the best method of stocking the territories of neighbouring states when they shall have stolen them. It can be matched only by the celebrated Ostend declaration, in which President Buchanan and two more American ministers, stationed at European courts, declared it to be evident that Cuba naturally belongs to the United States, and that if Spain refused to sell it they must take it; or, again, by his proposal to Congress to make an appropriation of money for the purchase, while Spain continued indignantly to refuse the transaction.

In the face of these declarations the prohibition of the African slave trade in the Confederate constitution may safely be considered as merely illusory—a sham resorted to in the hope of English intervention, and ready to be laid aside as soon as independence is secured; and we therefore repeat that the legal development of the African slave trade under an independent national flag, and by its means the unlimited extension of slavery, were and still are the objects really sought by secession. For, so far as we can see, there is no reason why these objects should not even yet be successfully carried out, for all that is come and gone, if the independence of the South should even now be obtained by European intervention.

From the Kansas episode which we have already related, we may infer, that to carry out these objects no outrage is too shameful to be committed by the inferior agents of this great conspiracy, with the full connivance and patronage of the chiefs. The conduct of the party after it received the check in Kansas, and after the formation of the "Free-soil" party, clearly proved that it was resolved either to be all in all in the Union, or else to abandon it. If the slave system could be more dominant than ever, the Union might still be worth preserving, at least for a time; if not, the sooner it was broken up the better. This state of feeling alone will explain the use made of the four years of Mr. Buchanan's office as President. Instead of moderating their pretensions, the Southern leaders were bolder than ever. They avowed in the Senate of the United States, in public meetings, and by the press, their resolution to reopen the African slave trade; and meanwhile, though by law a capital crime, it was carried on without concealment.* At this crisis also, they determined to push their pretensions much farther than they had ever done before. The opportunity was favourable. All questions of constitutional law are decided by the "Supreme Court of the United States," and the judges of that court having been carefully selected by Presidents of their own party were men upon whom they could wholly depend.

It had hitherto been the universal doctrine of all the courts that slavery was merely a "peculiar institution" of certain states, and that outside of these states the law knew nothing of it except by special enactment. Freedom was the law, slavery the exception. This had been strikingly exemplified in the case of the territories,—or unsettled lands belonging to the Union, but not yet admitted to the rank of States. When the Union was made, a vast district of this class—of which the five free States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin were afterwards formed—already belonged to the United States. From this whole district slavery was at once and for ever banished by an act of Congress.† This act had always

* *The Richmond (Texas) Reporter*, May 14, 1859, had the following advertisement:—"FOR SALE, four hundred AFRICAN NEGROES, lately landed on the coast of Texas. Said negroes will be sold on most reasonable terms. For further information, inquire of C. R. C., Houston, or L. R. G., Galveston"—(Cairnes, p. 245).

† It is remarkable that those to whose authority Lord Lothian has trusted (far more enamoured of slavery than the slaveowners of 1789), have induced him to complain of this act as an injustice to the South! He says (p. 118), "There seems to be no question that these states ought to have been admitted as slave states," and laments that "the exacerbated state of mind arising out of the long national contest, which had been growing more and more irrecon-

been held to be binding, so that when at a later period attempts were made to introduce slavery into Illinois and Indiana (before they became states) they were at once stopped by the central government. What makes the passing of that act more remarkable is that this whole district was given to the United States by Virginia, itself a slave state, with the specific condition that it should be made (when sufficiently settled) into five free states.* Strange as this may now seem, it was really simple enough. Slavery was then regarded by all Americans alike as an evil, which could not at the moment be wholly got rid of, but which it was hoped would soon die out, and which no man dreamed of extending to any district where it did not yet exist. It was only by the great demand for cotton which arose some years later, that this feeling was changed. The change was marked by the contest about Missouri, between 1819 and 1820, and the compromise by which it was terminated. In 1850 that compromise was repudiated by the South, and the principle was established that each territory should settle for itself whether or not it would admit slavery. It will be observed that ever since 1789 the slave interest had been gradually encroaching, and that it had hitherto carried every question which it had raised. In 1856, however, the Southern leaders advanced a wholly new and most startling claim. They declared that all that had hitherto been done upon this subject was unconstitutional,† and therefore null and void;

cilable, interposed a fatal barrier to the course which justice demanded, in the making Ohio and the other four states slave states." We need hardly say that this arrangement was made by the consent of both parties, years before the said contest began. His theory that slavery would have died out in the border states, but for "the anti-slavery cry," is equally absurd. It is much as if the French should declare the wars against England from 1793 to 1814 to have been caused by the imprisonment of Napoleon in St. Helena. The fact is, that slavery in Virginia began to pay, as we have elsewhere shown from the mouths of Virginian legislators, when the demand for slaves in the South made the breeding of slaves a lucrative trade. This was certainly before the Missouri dispute in 1817. But the Abolition movement did not begin till 1833.

* Since this was in type we find it stated that this was, like the other arrangements of which we have spoken, a "compromise;" Virginia offered this as a compensation for the first "Fugitive Slave Law" of 1789.

† This word has in America a special meaning. When an Englishman declares any act of Parliament unconstitutional, he means that it violates the principles of our constitution, and therefore ought not to have been passed. He never questions that, when enacted, it is law; because the authority of the sovereign, acting with the advice and assent of Parliament, is absolute and final. But Congress has only a delegated and limited power, and if it goes beyond that power, its acts are null and void. Such, by the consent of all men, would be an act to establish or abolish slavery in any state. The Constitution provides a process by which it may be amended from time to time. But an act of Congress is not sufficient for that purpose.

that neither the Congress of the Union, nor any state or territory, had any right to exclude slavery from any part of the United States or its territories; and this pretension it was resolved to establish by a judgment of the Supreme Court. The case selected was that of Dred Scott, a slave who had been taken by his master, first into the free state of Illinois, and afterwards into a territory in which (before he was taken there) slavery had been declared to be illegal by act of Congress. The cause was decided by the courts of the slave state of Missouri, which (following the stream of all the decisions in all courts up to that time) pronounced that a slave under these circumstances became free, and did not lose his freedom even by returning to the slave state from which he had been brought. It was then brought by appeal before the Supreme Court, which decided—*first*, that in the contemplation of the law there was no difference between a slave and any other kind of property; and *secondly*, that any American citizen might settle, with his property, in any part of the Union, and that wherever he settled his property of all kinds was protected by the law. "The effect of this decision," says Professor Cairnes very truly,—

Was to reverse the fundamental assumption upon which up to that time society in the Union had been based; and whereas formerly freedom had been regarded as the rule, and slavery as the exception, to make slavery in future the rule of the Constitution. According to the law as expounded by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, it was now competent to a slaveholder to carry his slaves not merely into any portion of the territories, but, if it pleased him, into any of the free states—to establish himself with his slave retinue in Ohio or Massachusetts, or Pennsylvania or New York, and to hold his slaves in bondage there, the regulations of Congress or the laws of the particular states notwithstanding. The Union, if this doctrine were to be accepted, was henceforth a single slaveholding domain, in every part of which property in human beings was equally sacred. So sweeping were the consequences involved in the Dred Scott decision. Reading that decision in the light of subsequent events, we cannot but admire the sagacious foresight of Tocqueville. "The President who exercises a limited power may err without causing great mischief in the state. Congress may decide amiss without destroying the Union, because the electoral body in which Congress originates may cause it to retract its decision by changing its members. But if the Supreme Court is ever composed of imprudent men or bad citizens, the Union may be plunged into anarchy or civil war"—(p. 252).

But the principles laid down in the judgment went farther still. They affected not slaves merely, but free people, whether negroes, or with the slightest mixture of negro blood. It had always been the invariable doctrine of the courts, in the words of Chancellor Kent: "If a slave be born in the United

States, and lawfully discharged from bondage, or if a black man be born free in the United States, he becomes thenceforth a citizen." The same author says: "The constitution and statute law of New York speak of men of colour being citizens," and if this were law, then by the constitution of the Union they were citizens in any other state to which they might move. In the *Dred Scott* case the judges laid it down as law that no free coloured person was or could, under any circumstances, become a citizen. They even declared: "Such persons have been regarded as unfit to associate with the white race, either in social or political relations, and so far inferior that they have no rights which the white man is bound to respect."

This judgment was the retort of the Southern party to the public manifesto of the "Free-soil party."* It was so received. The slaveholding party at once assumed that it finally settled all questions between the North and the South. Their opponents denied that it was a judicial decision at all. The majority of the Court had pronounced at the outset that *Dred Scott* had no right to bring this case before them. It was therefore contended that what the judges had pronounced was merely an extra-judicial opinion on a case not before them.

Be this as it may, the judgment was connected in a very suspicious manner with violent party moves. By an arrangement, very inconvenient in practice, the President, though virtually elected in November, does not come into office until four months later, on March 4th. It is stated that the judgment had been prepared, and even communicated to parties concerned, several months before it was delivered, but was suppressed during the election, and the four months following it, "for fear of injuring Mr. Buchanan's prospects, or embarrassing his entrance on office." In his inaugural address, on March 4th, 1857, while professing not to know what the decision would be, he "so earnestly exhorted all men to a ready

* We are far from intending any insinuation against the judges of the Supreme Court. We are bound to suppose that they decided as they believed the "Constitution of the United States" required them to decide. Still it is not less certain that their judgment was a momentous innovation upon the law as it had always from the beginning been understood and acted upon by all courts, as well in the South as the North. It happened, moreover, that the judges by whom it was delivered had been appointed by Presidents who were strong Southern party men. Five of the judges were slaveholders. The other four, though Northern men, were of the same views and party. But what decidedly marked it as a party move was, that it was clearly brought before the court by men of the slaveholding party, and was claimed by them as a great victory. In fact, no one thing so directly led to the subsequent events, the election of Mr. Lincoln, the secession, and—the war.

acceptance of it" as a final settlement of the question in dispute, that his hearers felt no doubt what to expect.

Four days later the momentous judgment was delivered. Mr. Buchanan's administration soon showed how little it intended to mince matters. The principles thus for the first time laid down were so fully carried to their results, that passports, which had always been given by the authorities of the Union to coloured men visiting Europe, were denied, on the ground that they were not citizens. Nay, although it had been decided by the Courts in the Presidentship of Madison (a Southern man) that men of colour were competent to register and sail vessels under the United States flag, and might command them in person, those things were now for the first time denied to them. Again, the benefit of the law which gives a pre-emption of waste lands in the territories to any one who brings them into cultivation, was, on the same grounds, for the first time refused to men of colour.

It was manifest that as long as the slave party could control the administration and patronage of the Union, and especially the appointment of the judges of the Supreme Court, they could practically do what they pleased. Everything, however, turned upon that. A hostile administration might overthrow all they were doing; and accordingly while Mr. Buchanan's administration was carrying on the government in the manner we have described, several at least of its leading members (whether with or without his knowledge does not seem certain) were making active preparations to facilitate the secession, if their party should not succeed in carrying the election of his successor. When Mr. Lincoln's election was announced, it took place. Mr. Buchanan used his four remaining months to propose a plan of conciliation, in which he stated what amount of concession would induce the Southern States to remain in the Union. What he demanded in their name, was an alteration of the Constitution which would give greater security to slave property.* Everything showed that the slaveholders had fully made up their mind either to acquire new power in the Union such as they had never yet possessed, or to found a separate slave confederacy. All circumstances proved that the secession, which on this side of the Atlantic was supposed to be produced by an ungovernable and unaccountable outbreak of irritation caused by the loss of an

* It would not be necessary to mention in America, but it is worth notice here, that this proposal related to slavery and to slaves only. Of the question of tariffs, which on this side the Atlantic has for obvious reasons been represented as the real cause of secession, he said nothing.

election, was really the deliberate execution of a design formed long before by able politicians, and on solid political grounds.

For the fact is that circumstanced as the Southern leaders were, it had become to them a matter of necessity either to dictate more decidedly than ever the policy of the United States, or to separate from them. Any middle course would have been ruinous to the slave interest. We would earnestly beg any reader who is startled at this assertion, carefully to study Professor Cairnes' "Slave Power," especially from Chapter 2 to Chapter 6. In these chapters, indeed, they will find no principle laid down which has not for years been admitted as unquestionable by all competent judges, who have fairly investigated the nature and working of negro slavery; but they will find them stated and explained and applied to the case before us, with remarkable clearness, talent, and fairness. It may seem strange to say that the book is more valuable because it urges no philanthropic arguments. It is the fashion to suppose that all who oppose negro slavery must needs be "sickly philanthropists." Now we have yet to learn that philanthropy, when sincere and prudent, is any disgrace either to men or nations. There is a day coming in which no man will be the worse for having been influenced by a tender regard for the happiness and interests even of the most abject members of the human race, although it should have led him to sacrifices as great as those made by the B. Peter Claver. We are also certain that cases of extreme cruelty are numerous, and that the other evil effects of the system both upon the enslaved and the dominant class are so horrible that such cases may be considered its least evil effect. But if any one should maintain that the effects of the African slave trade, both upon the negroes imported into America and upon Africa itself, are purely beneficent; that every individual negro slave is happier and better off than he would have been as a free man, either in Africa or in America; and, lastly, that negroes will not labour except as slaves—we might concede these somewhat extraordinary statements, without the least shaking the solidity of Professor Cairnes' arguments. Even so, this augmented happiness and welfare of the negro may be bought too dear. Professor Cairnes undertakes to prove that slave labour can pay only under certain exceptional conditions. Where slaves can be obtained at a cheap rate, and be employed upon exceedingly rich lands, by a method of culture requiring little or no skill or machinery, and admitting of their being worked in gangs, so that a single overseer may inspect and compel the labour of a considerable number, slavery brings in large profits.

The use of skill and machinery it precludes, as slaves cannot be trusted with them. Moreover, it banishes free labour; for, in a community in which labour is the badge of a slave, it becomes disgraceful. Consequently, in every country in which negro slavery prevails the poor members of the white caste are invariably degraded, and become little better than savages; and as only the choice lands repay cultivation by slave-labour, large districts remain in every extensive slave country, over which these men roam. Thus it is to be observed that the "mean whites" of the slave states are not an accidental inconvenience, but a necessary part of the system. Such a class has always existed alongside of every large body of slaves, whether in the United States, the British colonies, or in South America. But even the richest lands become exhausted by the production of the same crops year after year, and hence it has ever been found that the plantations and districts which for some years have yielded the largest returns under this system, have each in turn ceased to pay, and in most instances, after a long and painful struggle, have been abandoned and suffered to return to waste. When this time arrives, the slaves become a mere burden, and can be made a gain to their owners only by being removed to new situations, where the same process may be repeated. Hence slavery confined to one spot would before very long die out, and slaveholders are driven by necessity to seek not to keep things as they are, but to extend and develop slave cultivation. From the combined action of these causes, there arises a very peculiar social system, unlike any other, and yet reproducing itself in many different regions and among different nations. It is in fact the result in each of the same causes. There is first a wealthy and refined oligarchy, depending not upon trade or professional success, debarred by the social condition of the community from most of the careers of such men in other lands, and hence usually devoting their energies either to war or politics.* Meanwhile, in the very large class of white men who despise work, and acquire lawless habits, these leaders have admirable materials for the rank and file of an army. The labour of the country is thrown upon the slaves. Such a society may have a considerable number of rich individuals, but as a society it must always be poor, and even distressed.

* It has often been observed that the great majority of the naval and military officers of the United States, and of the statesmen, have been furnished by the slave states. Yet the whites there are only about eight millions, compared with about nineteen millions in the free states, and of these more than half are "mean whites." The fact is that the officers and statesmen are furnished by a very small proportion of the white population.

The only remedy for its relief is in an importation of slaves on a large scale, and even this is only such a remedy as brandy for delirium tremens. National wealth is the result of national industry; it cannot be obtained where labour is a brand, compulsory upon one section of society, and avoided by all the rest. Civilization, though carried to a great extent among a limited class, cannot be diffused; for it is by concentration and competition that the intellect of the mass of any people becomes cultivated: and the habits of life of the "mean whites" cause them to be so thinly scattered over huge regions that it has been found that very few of them can even read or write.* The poverty, therefore, of the South, as compared with the North, though prodigious, is no prodigy. What Lord Lothian says on this subject reminds us of the Presbyterian preacher to whom it seemed a great proof of the Divine goodness that most great cities are on the banks of rivers, where they can be easily supplied with provisions. He says, "The Southern States were entirely dependent on foreigners for subsistence. The products of their soil were valuable only as articles of commerce, raised with the view of exportation either to the north or north-west, whence they get the greater part of their clothing and food, or to Europe. The Southern States were not manufacturing states. The shipping and mercantile interests lie chiefly in the North." It does not seem to have occurred to him to inquire "why is all this?" So far as appears, he thinks it a matter either of destiny or sheer chance that the shipping of a single Northern port far exceeds that of all the slave states together; that there is such a connection as that of cause and effect he seems to have forgotten. There are those upon whom it has been impressed by bitter experience. Mr. Helper is himself a Southerner, and his family held property in South Carolina a century ago. It had decayed, and he has been led to ask why? The result is one of the most remarkable works published of late years,—*"The Impending Crisis of the South."* It proves by dry statistics that the slave states

* An able and learned writer in the *Rambler*, May, 1861, is aghast at Emerson's calling the Southern states "a barbarous community." He quotes the words of the late Earl of Carlisle:—"It would be uncandid to deny that the planter in the Southern states has much more in his manner and mode of intercourse that resembles the English country gentleman, than any other class of his countrymen." Upon this there could not be a better witness; but that lamented nobleman we imagine would have been the last to deny that the whole constitution of Southern society, and the character and mode of life of the great majority of the inhabitants, fully deserve Mr. Emerson's censure.

are day by day decaying, and that slavery is the cause of their decay. The book has been answered forcibly we admit, but not to our mind convincingly; for it was by beating the author within an inch of his life in the Capitol at Washington. It is to be had in England, and we would very heartily recommend it to the diligent study of the Marquis of Lothian. He has abundant talents to write very usefully upon this or other subjects. As for his present book, it strongly reminds us of Lord Macaulay's commendation of Sir William Temple's work upon the "Ancient Learning." "It really deserves the praise—whatever that may be worth—of being the best book ever written by any man upon the wrong side of a question of which he was profoundly ignorant."

The state of society in the slave states being such as we have seen, we may say of them what Bailie Nicol Jarvie did of the highlanders when Frank Osbaldistone compassionately ejaculated—"It makes me shudder to think of their situation,"—"Sir, ye wad, may-be, shudder mair if ye were living near hand them." For never certainly was there a system which combined like this the strongest temptations to aggression with the ablest instruments and widest opportunities for it. What would be the character and spirit of a powerful nation founded wholly upon this system and unchecked by relations, whether of union or dependence, with any other, we can only conjecture, for happily the world has not seen it. If the Confederate States had obtained their object as easily as they hoped, our experience would soon have been enlarged.

Our readers we think will agree with us that the Confederate secession was the result of a deliberate and foresighted project to establish a great aggressive and conquering empire upon the basis of a vast development of negro slavery and of the African slave trade; and that, if the North had quietly submitted, there was good reason to believe that the project would fully have succeeded. We are of course quite aware that the object of the North in undertaking this horrible war was not mere philanthropy. Why should we have expected it of any nation? Nor do we forget the horrible injustice and cruelty shown until the other day to the negro race in the Northern States. But, remembering all this, we cannot shut our eyes to the high-minded spirit in which the people of the Northern States responded to the call of national honour, and we must ever regret that their conduct has been so unjustly appreciated in England. We heartily agree with Professor Cairnes:—

The spectacle which the North presented at the opening of the war was such as I think might well have called forth [a feeling of admiration]. It

was the spectacle of a people which, having long bent its neck before a band of selfish politicians, and been dragged by them through the mire of shameless transactions, had suddenly recovered the consciousness of its power and responsibilities, and, shaking itself free from the spell, stood erect before the men who had enthralled its conscience and its will. A community, the most eager in the world in the chase after gain, forgot its daily pursuit; parties a month before arrayed against each other in a great political contest, laid aside their party differences; a whole nation merging all private aims in the single passion of patriotism, rose to arms as a single man; and this for no selfish object, but to maintain the integrity of their common country, and to chastise a band of conspirators, who, in the wantonness of their audacity, had dared to attack it. The Northern people, conscious that it had risen above the level of ordinary motives, looked abroad for sympathy, and especially looked to England. It was answered with cold criticism and derision. The response was perhaps natural under the circumstances [because we had looked for an anti-slavery crusade], but undoubtedly not more so than the bitter mortification and resentment which that response evoked"—(p. 24).

Horrible, therefore, as have been, and still are, the calamities of this hideous war, we cannot admit that the Northern States are fighting for empire, as the French government fought to annex Savoy and Nice, or might now fight to annex Belgium. They entered into the war to maintain the integrity of their country, and under a mistaken belief that the mass of the people in the Southern States were reluctantly compelled to secede by a few turbulent leaders, and would gladly embrace the opportunity of throwing off their yoke when the Northern armies appeared. We do not see how this can be blamed by those who believe that our own struggle against Napoleon and Louis XIV. was laudable. But it is the invariable effect of such struggles to bring into relief the real matters at issue; and as the war has gone on, the Northern people have daily seen more and more clearly that slavery is the real cause of the whole war, and that to restore their country they must destroy slavery. We have already said that this is not mere philanthropy. It is certain that many of those who are now expressly and consciously fighting for the destruction of slavery would be glad to hear that every negro in America had been swept into the Atlantic. But it also seems to us that as the real issues of the war develop themselves, the men of the North have met them (on the whole, and not without exceptions) in a very noble and manly spirit. As to the President himself, all the world knows that he avowed his object in the war to be the preservation of the Union, that he deferred his anti-slavery measures as long as he could, and adopted them only one by one, reluctantly, and as he became convinced that each of them was essential to the object with which he drew

the sword. We have been much struck by his own simple and manly explanation of his conduct and motives, as quoted by Professor Goldwin Smith.* He says: "If slavery is not wrong, nothing is wrong. I cannot remember when I did not so feel and think, and yet I have never understood that the Presidency conferred upon me an unrestricted right to act officially upon this judgment and feeling. It was in the oath I took that I would, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the constitution of the United States. I could not take the office without taking the oath; nor was it in my view to take an oath to get power, and break the oath in using the power." Hence "I aver that, to this day, I have done no official act in mere deference to my abstract judgment and feeling on slavery." And then he explains that he believes the constitution authorises the President when, "in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it" (these words are quoted from the constitution), to exercise extraordinary powers, and that all he has done beyond the ordinary constitution he has done in the belief that it was necessary, and that the constitution authorised him to do it when he judged it so to be.

This seems to us the language of an honest and straightforward man, such as we take Mr. Lincoln to be; and accordingly in his last Message he distinctly declares that if the United States think fit to undo anything that he has done in the direction of negro freedom, they must find some other instrument of their will, for that instrument he will not be. We are glad to believe that his deeds will answer to these manly words, and we do believe it. And fully admitting that the preservation of the Union—not negro emancipation—has been (and we will add, has justly and righteously been) the object of this terrible war, we cannot fail to see the hand of God in its results. For the last three years have done more for the American negro than any reasonable man hoped to see done in as many generations. In them Kansas has been admitted into the Union as a free state; a treaty conceding the right of search for the suppression of the slave trade has been made with Great Britain (April 7, 1862); to carry out this treaty "a judge and arbitrator has been appointed to reside at each of these ports—New York, Cape Town, and Sierra Leone," by act of Congress, July 11, 1862. The coolie trade (which seemed likely to become another slave trade) was abolished, February 19, 1862. Slavery was for ever abolished in all Territories of the United States, whether actual or future, June 18, 1862.

* See the Professor's very interesting article in *Macmillan's Magazine*, Feb., 1865, p. 300.

It was abolished in the district of Columbia, including the city of Washington, April 16, 1862. By another act, July 12, 1862, it was provided that slaves brought from any state into the district of Columbia at any time after April 12, should be free. An offer was made to any slave state which would abolish slavery, of assistance from the treasury of the Union, April 10, 1862. The negro republics of Hayti and Liberia have been recognized, and diplomatic representatives appointed to reside in their capitals. Free coloured persons are placed upon equal footing with whites in all legal proceedings in the district of Columbia (May 21, 1862), in which hitherto the laws had been those of the slave states, which exclude their testimony, and subject them to punishments for acts not forbidden to whites, and to more severe punishment than whites for acts forbidden to both. A special board of trustees has been appointed by act of Congress to superintend schools in the district for the education of coloured children, which in the slave states is forbidden as a crime. The Fugitive Slave Law of 1850, and with it the far less stringent act of 1793, have been repealed. Steps have been taken towards obtaining, in constitutional form, the abolition of slavery within the whole Union. By a fundamental law of the United States, changes in the constitution can be made if they are voted by two-thirds of each House of Congress; and "ratified by the Legislature of three-fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three-fourths thereof." A law to abolish slavery for ever throughout the United States has already passed both Houses by more than the required majority, and has already been ratified by the legislatures of several states. The American papers speak confidently of its obtaining the ratification by the proportion required. In that case slavery will be as legally abolished in the United States as it is in the British empire. How it can be effected as long as the seceding states are counted as belonging to the Union we do not understand, unless a considerable number of new Free states should first be admitted. The Northern papers, however, are sanguine on this point; and, be this as it may, that the Congress of the United States by an overwhelming majority should have voted such a change in the Constitution is a fact of immense importance, and can hardly fail to produce momentous permanent effects. It is hard to imagine that peace can hereafter be made upon any conditions which maintain slavery, unless, indeed, what we will not imagine, European intervention should enable the South to make its own terms. The western part of the state of Virginia having separated itself from the rest of the state, has been admitted into the

Union as a free state.* The states of Missouri and Maryland have just passed acts for immediate emancipation. The same has also been done in the slave states of Louisiana and Arkansas, to which we attach less importance, as they are occupied as conquests by the forces of the United States, and their acts are, probably, those of a minority. We take the fact to be that the war had virtually freed the slaves, so that an act of emancipation cost little.† Yet the war is said to have been without result. Let any man open a map of the United States. If, in December, 1860, the Northern Government had said (as was proposed by the highly respectable authority of General Scott), "Erring sisters, part in peace," Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, and all the district south of them, would have been permanently lost not to the Union only but to freedom. Even now, should peace be made on the basis *uti possidetis*, the slave power and its institution would be shut up east of the Mississippi; and to the North, it would lose all Kentucky and the greater part of Virginia; to say nothing of the Sea Islands and other great districts upon the coasts of South Carolina and Georgia, which are held by the North, and at this moment are under cultivation by the negroes as free men. The possession of the Mississippi, if that were all, would be worth anything to the United States, for it is essential to the permanence of their hold upon the North-Western States. It is everything to the interests of emancipation, because it cuts off Texas and the huge districts of New Mexico, Arizona, &c., from being colonized by slaves. It is therefore certain that the war has already produced results as important as those of any war recorded in history.

And yet we doubt whether its most important results have not been in the change of feeling which it has produced. This has been shown, no doubt, in the passing of those legislative enactments which we have enumerated, and yet it is shown even more in the practical treatment both of the free coloured people and of those who were lately slaves, by the whites of the Northern States. Remembering what was but yesterday their feeling and conduct towards these classes, as well as the avowed intentions of the Southern States with regard to slavery, it would indeed be sanguine to feel free

* The population of this state is 393,234, its slave population only 20,620. The emancipation of these is to be gradual.

† We have abridged this enumeration chiefly from Mr. Trimble's "Review of the American Struggle" (London: Whittaker). We would earnestly recommend this very clear and valuable pamphlet, to those who wish to have the facts of the contest in a few pages.

from great anxiety and alarm as to the future of the negro race in America. Yet there are many and bright signs of hope. First of all is the large enlistment of negro troops in the Northern armies. Then the change already observable in Northern society. At Washington negro gentlemen are now publicly received to audiences by the President with as much civility as whites. A negro of unmixed blood has just been solemnly admitted as a barrister in the same "Supreme Court" of the United States which deliberately pronounced only eight years ago that no negro could have any rights. In New York negroes take their place in public carriages with whites, as they do in London. We have lately seen in New York papers complaints that this is still refused in Philadelphia. Above all, the treatment of the multitudes of slaves who have sought the protection of the United States in South Carolina, Georgia, and the valley of the Mississippi, is now, on the whole, noble. Their number, first and last, can hardly have been less than two millions. For this huge multitude, shelter, food, clothing, organization, and education had to be provided by a government which was maintaining some half a million of men in arms, amid all the excitement of almost incessant and bloody conflicts. Under these circumstances, men have been unreasonable enough to complain that in some instances the best has not been done for them. For ourselves, we cannot but feel that to have undertaken the task, and done very much towards its full accomplishment, is one of the grandest feats that any nation has ever performed.

But much as has been done, it would seem that the next scene in this awful tragedy is to be something much more important. The march of General Sherman through the state of Georgia, the ease with which he occupied Savannah, and the fall of Charleston, suggest the belief that the Southern leaders have been driven to the point at which they must choose between the abandonment of slavery and submission to the North. Already we hear of proposals to give freedom and arms to a vast number of negroes. A great meeting at Charleston has objected that to give freedom to the negro as a reward for services implies that he is happier and better as a freeman than as a slave. Such objections apparently will be overborne, and if this plan is adopted deliberately and after consideration, it is hard to imagine that slavery can much longer be maintained, be the immediate conclusion of the present struggle what it may.

When last we addressed our readers on this great subject—now exactly a year ago—the triumph of the North was

commonly regarded by Englishmen as hopeless; while it is now considered by them almost certain. That our own opinion during the same period has more or less changed on this and kindred matters, we do not affect to deny. But on the main aspect of the case we have been clear from the first, viz., that the war has throughout really turned on the question of slavery; that no war could possibly present an issue more momentous; and that the one termination most earnestly to be desired, is simply such as may most effectually free the American States from that prolific source of sin and misery—the slave system there established.

ART. IV.—THEINER'S MATERIALS OF IRISH HISTORY.

Vetera Monumenta Hibernorum et Scotorum Historiam illustrantia, quæ ex Vaticani, Neapolis ac Florentiæ Tabulariis deprompsit et Ordine Chronologico disposuit AUGUSTINUS THEINER, Presbyter Cong. Oratorii, &c. Ab Honorio PP. III. usque ad Paulum PP. III., 1216—1547. Folio. Romæ, Typis Vaticanis. 1864.

JUST twenty years ago, in discussing the prospects of the study of Irish history, and in estimating the extent and the accessibility of the authentic materials for the purpose, we held out a hope that the great collection of the Vatican might be looked to, as among the most promising sources of original materials.* We gave reason to believe that the distinguished scholar whose name stands at the head of these pages would take advantage of the opportunity afforded by his researches in general history to bring together and methodise those documents in the archives of the Vatican which specially regard Ireland, or tend to illustrate its annals. The expectation then expressed has been tardy of fulfilment. But the interval, if productive of little fruit for Ireland, has been worthily employed by Mgr. Theiner in other labours, which, if less directly valuable to us for the history of that country, are full of interest, either for the general history of the Church, or for that of other national churches in their relation to general history. It is hardly necessary to mention Mgr. Theiner's well-known labours in the great work of his Order—the continuation of the "Annals of Baronius." He has already added three folio volumes to the

* DUBLIN REVIEW, 1st series, Vol. xviii. p. 215.

series, beginning at 1572. Simultaneously with this publication, he also prepared a great collection on the history of Hungary,* which extends to three volumes folio, and was published in 1859. A similar collection, relating to the history of the Russian Church under Alexis, Feodor III., and Peter the Great,† was published in the same year. A third collection, on Polish history,‡ occupies no fewer than four folio volumes, to which has been added a special volume on the history of the southern Slaves.§ And in the midst of all these labours he found time to contribute to the memorable controversy on the Temporal Sovereignty of the Pope, what must henceforth be regarded as the great repertory of the sources of that history—the now well-known “Codex Diplomaticus Domini Temporalis S. Sedis,”|| in three massive folio volumes.

At length, in the comprehensive circle of Mgr. Theiner's studies, the turn of the Irish Church has come. The handsome volume now before us contains what may, we trust, be regarded as but the first instalment of the materials of that department of Irish history, for which it is almost hopeless to look elsewhere than in the great storehouse of the Vatican archives. The collection commences with the Pontificate of Honorius III., 1216, and extends to that of Paul III., 1547, a space of more than three hundred years; and it comprises in the whole one thousand and seventy-four documents of the most various character—letters to and from Rome, bulls, briefs, consistorial acts, reports of nuncios, of apostolic visitors or of Papal collectors, appeals to the Holy See, instructions to the judges appointed to try such appeals, and other papers of similar character. Of these, however, not much more than the half relate to Ireland. About one-third part of the collection consists of similar documents, relating to Scotland; and the papers of the Pontificate of Clement VII. include a large and important series of letters from Henry VIII. of England, not confined, as in other reigns, to the ecclesiastical affairs of Ireland and of Scotland, but also embracing the general history of his reign, and especially the negotiations in reference to the suit for the dissolution of his marriage with

* “*Vetera Monumenta Hungariam Sacram illustrantia*,” iii. vols., fol. Romæ, Typis Vaticanis. 1859.

† “*Monuments Historiques relatifs aux Règnes d’Alexis Michaelowitsch, Feodor III., et Pierre le Grand*.” Fol. 1859.

‡ “*Vetera Monumenta Poloniæ Gentiumque finitimarum Historiam illustrantia*,” iv. voll. Romæ, 1860-4.

§ “*Vetera Monumenta Slavorum Meridionalium*.” Romæ, 1863.

|| Romæ, 1862.

Catherine of Arragon. Upon these latter papers we shall have occasion to offer a few remarks; but our main concern in the present notice is with the Irish portion of the collection.

Nor can we doubt that the first impression which readers previously unacquainted with the nature of the original materials for the history of Ireland during these three centuries will receive from a cursory inspection of Mgr. Theiner's volume, will be of grave disappointment. A large proportion of the papers are purely official documents, which consist chiefly of established technical forms, and which, beyond a few names and dates, throw little light on general history. Some of the Pontificates are, so far as regards Ireland, almost entirely unrepresented; others present but a few scattered notices; and not a single one contains anything approaching to what could furnish material for a complete and connected history, or even for an outline of the history, of the time. It is only those who have made early Irish history a special study, who are in a condition to estimate by comparison the value of the new materials which Mgr. Theiner has brought together. It needs but a very cursory examination of any of the original writers of the mediæval Church history of Ireland—of Colgan, of Wadding, in the Irish portion of his "*Annals*," or of Ware, especially in his "*Bishops*,"—to know that the original materials of the history are almost entirely of the class which forms the staple of this volume; that the Church historian of Ireland has comparatively little aid from that which forms so large an element in the history of other Churches—contemporary memoirs, chronicles (except of a very meagre kind), correspondence, or biography; and that even of that class of documents which are still available, the stock is scanty and precarious, scattered through various collections, and mainly derived from authorities unconnected with Ireland, and often indifferent or even hostile to her good name. Wadding, it is true, had access to the Roman archives; but Ware's authorities on Irish affairs are almost exclusively the acts in Rymer, or the Rolls, and other similar records of the English State-Paper Office.

That during these centuries the contents of the Roman archives bearing upon Ireland should be scanty and disjointed will create but little surprise. It may be gathered from a notice prefixed to the summary of the letters of Innocent III. on Irish affairs, "which have perished through the ravages of time," that the originals of all the earlier Papal documents on Ireland have shared the same fate. And even within the Pontificates comprised in Mgr. Theiner's volume, the circumstances, whether of the Irish Church or of the Roman See

itself, were the very reverse of favourable, either to the regular intercourse of the Churches, or to the secure preservation of the documents which might be exchanged between them. For Ireland the period which followed the Invasion was one of long-continued trouble and disorganization; and although the communication with Rome, and the reference to the authority of that See, were never entirely interrupted, even in the height of the contest, yet it is impossible to doubt that it was not only less frequent, but less free than in the days of national independence. And as regards Rome, it is only necessary to recall the long residence of the Papal Court at Avignon, and still more, the protracted Schism of the West, the conflicting claims of the rival lines of Pontiffs, and, above all, their frequent migrations, and the general disorganization of the official system thereby entailed,—in order to account, even to the widest extent, for the defective and mutilated character of the documents which ought to represent the normal relations of Rome with the Irish and other remote national churches.

The great value, therefore, of a collection such as the present is less to supply satisfactory materials for a complete history of the period, than to serve as a supplement and, in some respects, as a check upon the results of such researches as the materials hitherto available have permitted; and it will be seen hereafter that Mgr. Theiner's documents serve, in a very remarkable way, to fill up many gaps in the succession of the various Sees, as arranged by Ware in his "*Bishops of Ireland*," as well as to correct many erroneous statements or conjectures of that writer.

Before we proceed, however, to examine in detail the documents comprised in the volume, we must call attention to one or two very important results of the publication, which cannot fail to strike every reader, even upon the most cursory examination.

On the first of these it is hardly necessary to dwell. Few scholars now-a-days remember the once popular topic of anti-Roman controversy in Ireland—viz., that it is to the English Invasion the Irish Church is indebted for her subjugation to Rome, and for the forfeiture of her independence as a national church, which she had enjoyed up to that period. Even if we could forget the relations between Rome and Ireland, which the nunciature of Cardinal Paparo twenty years before the Invasion, reveal, there needs but a glance at the very headings of the documents in the early Pontificates comprised in this volume, to dissipate for ever this silly theory. From the very first of these documents to the last, the Papal prero-

gative appears in its fullest development, and speaks in its most authoritative tone; nor is there the slightest trace, on the side of Rome, of an effort to introduce its novel pretensions into Ireland, or of a desire, on the part of the Irish Church, or of any portion of it, to resist or to evade a newly-claimed jurisdiction. And even the most bigoted anti-Papalist who examines Mgr. Theiner's volume, will be forced to recognize the Papal authority complete, unquestioned, fully organised, and fully accepted in each and every instrument of the collection.

But, although this theory of the subjugation of Ireland to Rome by the English has now become almost antiquated, another more plausible, and with more appearance of warrant in some of the facts of the history, has recently been advanced in its stead. It is an application to Ireland of the theory which Augustin Thierry has so minutely elaborated in his "*Norman Conquest of England*;" with this additional circumstance, that what Thierry applies chiefly to the conflict of race in England, is extended in Ireland also to the relations of the two Churches which are supposed to be the representatives of the hostile races; and this not merely in their relations with one another, but also in the relations of both with Rome.

That a strong line of hostile demarcation was drawn between the English and Celtic races in Ireland after the Invasion, is well known; and that this line affected even the government of the Church, is equally manifest from numberless incidents of the history. But the most recent as well as the most learned writer upon the subject has pushed the principle far beyond the hitherto received views of Irish historians, whether Catholic or Protestant.

Dr. Todd, in the Introductory Dissertation of his "*Life of St. Patrick*," thus states and explains his view:—

In the first place it will be seen that there were two Churches in Ireland separated from each other, without any essential difference of discipline or doctrine, at a period long previous to the Reformation. The Church of the English Pale was at first strongly supported by all the power of the Court of Rome. The Church of the native Irish was discountenanced and ignored by Rome, as well as by England. It consisted of the old Irish clergy and inmates of the monasteries beyond the limits of the English Pale, who had not adopted the English manners or language, and who were therefore dealt with as rebels, and compelled to seek for support from the charity or devotion of the people. Many of these took refuge in foreign countries, or connected themselves with foreign emissaries, hostile to England, at home; but at a subsequent period, when the Anglo-Irish Church had accepted the Reformation, the "mere Irish" clergy were found to have become practically extinct. Their episcopacy had merged into or become identified with the episcopacy

which was recognised by the law. Missionary bishops and priests, therefore, ordained abroad, were sent into Ireland to support the interests of Rome ; and from them is derived a third Church in close communion with the See of Rome, which has now assumed the forms and dimensions of a national established religion."—*St. Patrick, Apostle of Ireland*, pp. 241-2.

Now, if there be any one distinguishing characteristic of Mgr. Theiner's collection of documents, we should say that it is their universality. They are not confined to any see or class of sees in Ireland. They are not addressed exclusively, nor even with any very notable preponderance, to the bishops of the Pale. There is not a single see or class of sees in Ireland, which can be said to be "discountenanced" or "ignored." There is not one which has not its share of notice from Rome. And we can assert with the most perfect confidence that there is not the slightest trace, in any one of the documents, of a systematic distinction on the part of Rome between any two Churches in Ireland, or any two bodies in the Irish Church, much less of any difference on the part of Rome, in the spirit or manner of its dealing with such hostile sections of the Church in Ireland.

It is true that the Papal documents of this collection exhibit the same purpose of supporting the English authority in Ireland, and of repressing or softening down the resistance of the native population, which is discoverable in all the proceedings of the pontiffs from the days of Adrian. We need but refer to the abstract of the letters of Innocent III. (p. 1), to those of Honorius III., in p. 10 and p. 26. We can hardly help even inferring from the language occasionally employed, that the allegations regarding the Irish population which formed the ground upon which Henry II. claimed the Papal sanction for his projected expedition continued for a long time to meet acceptance at Rome. But there is not a shadow of warrant for the assertion that the Popes at any time supported or countenanced an English or Anglo-Irish Church within the Pale in Ireland, to the "ignoring" of the "Church of the native Irish," or to the exclusion of the "old Irish clergy beyond the limits of the Pale." We find the Popes addressing themselves indiscriminately to the English bishops or communities of Dublin, of Waterford, of Meath, and of Ossory, and to the purely Celtic bishops and people of Raphoe and Derry in the north ; of Killaloe and Emly in the south ; and of Clonfert, Mayo, Killala, or Enaghdone in the west. We defy the most jealous criticism to detect a shade of difference in the spirit and tone in which they are respectively addressed, or in the policy which is pursued in reference to them. It is plain, in truth, that we have before us the working, as regards them all, of one uniform unvarying system, and that the documents

relating to each which have chanced to reach our time, do but exhibit the routine of the ordinary government of the Church.

And if there be any one fact more plain than another in the matter, it is the utter groundlessness of the notion that the native Irish Church beyond the limits of the Pale was "ignored" or "discountenanced" by Rome after the Invasion. The number of Papal documents in the collection addressed to the Church outside the Pale, certainly fully equals, if indeed it does not exceed, that addressed to what are regarded as the Anglo-Irish sees; and they all exhibit precisely the same spirit, and pursue exactly the same policy. If a question arises as to the condition of the Church of Mayo (p. 4), judges are named by the Pope to inquire and report. A disputed election to the Bishopric of Killaloe is referred in like manner to judges appointed by the Pope (p. 5). A retired bishop of Ardferf receives permission from Rome (p. 23) to exercise *pontificalia* within the diocese. The bishops of Emly and of Limerick are empowered to fix a pension for the Bishop of Ardferf (p. 31). The resignation of the Bishop of Raphoe is approved and accepted (p. 57). The Episcopal see of Rathlure is transferred to Derry (p. 48). All its former privileges are renewed in the new seat to which it has been transferred (p. 64). The bishops of Enaghdune and Clonfert, and the abbot of Enaghdune, all beyond the limits of the Pale, are appointed judges to try the cause of the Bishop of Limerick (p. 27), and on the other hand the Pale Archbishop of Dublin is informed that commissioners have been appointed to inquire into the causes of the bishops elect of Killaloe and Ardferf (p. 5). In one word, there is not the faintest shadow of reason for supposing that any distinction was made by Rome between the "native Irish" and "Anglo-Irish" Churches, or that a different policy was followed by Popes in reference to these two bodies, much less that the latter was either "discountenanced" or "ignored."

On the contrary, although, as we have said, the English cause in Ireland is consistently supported, and although submission to the authority of the King is more than once commanded in these documents, Mgr. Theiner's collection supplies an abundant refutation of the latter charge, namely; that the Popes discountenanced the native Irish clergy, and looked silently upon the unjust and oppressive measures adopted against them, even in their spiritual capacity, by the English, if indeed they did not positively lend themselves to the oppressor in this uncharitable policy.

Of the many cruel and oppressive measures which the English adopted against the Irish within the Pale, and which were at

last embodied in the provisions of the well known statute of Kilkenny, there is none against which every feeling of natural justice as well as of Christian charity revolts so strongly as that which excluded the native Irish even from the neutral, if not the common ground of the Church, and which found its full expression in those two provisions of the statute above named, which close against every born Irishman the monasteries, the collegiate churches, the cathedrals, the bishoprics, and in one word, all the ecclesiastical dignities of the land of his birth. The popular impressions regarding these regulations trace their origin to the statutes of the Parliament held in Kilkenny in 1367: but in reality they are of an origin much closer to the date of the Invasion; and within half a century after that event the spirit had manifested itself so offensively that, with all their desire to promote the peaceful submission of the Irish, we find the Popes interposing to condemn in the strongest terms this un-Christian policy. "It has frequently reached my ears," writes Pope Honorius in the year 1220, to James, his chaplain and Penitentiary, and the Legate of the Apostolic See, "that certain English have, with unheard of temerity and audacity, enacted that no clerk of Ireland, whatever may be his virtue or his learning, shall be elevated to any ecclesiastical dignity. Being unwilling, therefore, to turn a deaf ear to an abuse so presumptuous and so unjust, we by authority of this present letter command you to declare null and of no force an enactment which is devoid of all foundation in law or in honesty; and strictly to prohibit the English themselves from acting upon it, or from hereafter attempting anything of the same kind. We command you to proclaim that all Irish clerks of known virtue and learning are to be freely admitted to the dignities of the Church, if they be canonically elected."*

From the pertinacity with which even more than a century afterwards the same policy was maintained in the Pale, we may infer that the Pope's instructions to the Legate failed to produce their effect. Accordingly we find the Pope, four years later, addressing a similar letter to the Irish clergy themselves.†

Nor was it in favour of the clergy alone that the Pope interposed his authority. In a letter addressed to the same Legate within two days of the letter referred to, Honorius adverts in very strong terms upon "a detestable custom" which, "through the insolence of the English, had been intro-

* Letter of Honorius, dated Aug. 6th, 1220. Theiner, p. 16.

† Dated May 1st, 1224. Theiner, p. 24.

duced" into the province of Cashel,—that if an Englishman has lost anything and swears that it has been stolen by an Irishman, then, on the former's finding six of his countrymen to swear that they believe his testimony, the Irishman is to be compelled to make restitution, "however innocent and beyond suspicion his life may be, and although he may be prepared to prove his innocence of the alleged crime by the testimony of thirty witnesses or more." While, on the contrary, if an Irishman should lose anything, and should know for certain, and be prepared to swear, that it has been stolen by an Englishman, "the English refuse to accept his oath." After pointing out the crying evils of this unequal justice, which he declares to be "an abomination before the Lord," the Pope proceeds:—"We therefore commit it to your discretion that, notwithstanding this custom or rather abuse, which we desire shall be utterly abolished, you expressly order the English never henceforward to attempt anything of the kind; but, utterly ceasing from such perversity, to permit the weak and the strong to be judged with like judgment, and the causes of the rich and the poor to be weighed in the same balance, since the law of God forbids all acception of persons in affairs of justice."* And he concludes by ordering the Legate to "repress, by virtue of the apostolic authority," any one who may thenceforth presume to persist in so flagrant an abuse.

The well-known remonstrance of Pope John XXII. to Edward II., in 1318, on occasion of the address of O'Neill and the Irish chiefs to that pontiff, might be cited in illustration of the same policy of the Roman see; and the more so, as the Irish address was elicited by the instructions which John had issued to the Archbishops of Dublin and Cashel, after the rising of the northern Irish to join the invading army of Edward Bruce. If the Pope took the English side in the conflict, it is plain, from the earnestly indignant terms of his letter, that he was not forgetful of the interests of humanity and of the just rights of the Irish people; and the instructions to his Legate which accompanied the letter to the King is an evidence of the sincerity of his interposition and of the reality of his purpose. Both letters, which are already published in the *Bullarium* and other collections, are given by Mgr. Theiner in p. 201.

But we shall not dwell further on these very obvious considerations, suggested even at first sight by the general character of the documents comprised in the collection. We have already said that the chief use to which such a collection

* Letter of Honorius, August 8th, 1220.

can be turned is that of supplying the deficiencies of the existing materials of Irish history, or perhaps of testing their truthfulness and authenticity; and there is one department of the records of the Irish Church during the three centuries after the Invasion for which, as every student knows, such a test is specially desirable,—we mean the succession of archbishops and bishops in the several sees. It can hardly be considered creditable to our antiquarians that even still the sole authority upon the subject is Harris's Ware. Not that any one, whether Catholic or Protestant, is satisfied with his catalogue. Every one is to some extent cognizant of its deficiencies, and of its not unfrequent inaccuracy; but in a work of such extent, and one, we must add, for which the materials are so scanty and so difficult of access, the labour of a complete and searching criticism is so great, as, it would appear, to have deterred up to the present even the more laborious of the students of Irish ecclesiastical history. We cannot help thinking that the new light which such a series of documents as Mgr. Theiner has here brought together, along with the new light upon our domestic records which the systematic publication of the records and of the calendars of State Papers is calculated to afford, may so far diminish the difficulty of research as to induce some really competent scholar to undertake a complete revision of the existing catalogue of the several sees.

It is true that, for fully a hundred years after the invasion, the Vatican documents throw but little direct light on the names and successors of the bishops in Ireland; almost all the documents addressed to bishops during that time having a blank for the name of the bishop, and recording only that of the See. Nor even in those which follow does the family name appear, except in a few very notable cases. But the documents themselves in many instances supply indications by which it is easy to identify the individual, and still more frequently they throw light on points and circumstances which had hitherto appeared mysterious or obscure.

Still there are too many points, we regret to say, which, even with the aid of these papers, must yet remain in uncertainty. The long gap in the succession of the See of Dromore, for example, between Florence Mac Donegan in 1309 and Christopher in 1369, is still unsupplied. The curious discrepancy between the succession of Ossory as given by Ware, who assigns for 1367 (the year of the Statute of Kilkenny), the name of John Tateneal, and the actual signature of the Bishop of Ossory to the Statute, which is William, is not in any way explained; and there are several minor

difficulties, especially in the succession of the 13th century, for which we have in vain sought a solution in the new series of Papal documents. But in many other cases we have found them to supply, sometimes a most valuable commentary, sometimes a most useful check, on the successions of Ware, and upon the narrative or the explanation by which they are accompanied. We can only allude, of course, to a few examples; but several others have already been pointed out by a learned writer in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*; and we do not hesitate to say that there is hardly a single diocese in the series in which a careful examination of these papers will not discover new facts of interest, or errors of importance in the accounts hitherto received.

In the succession of Ardagh, for example, during the 14th century, Ware* places the episcopate of William Mac Casac in the years 1367-73, and represents him as succeeded by Charles or Carbrae O'Ferral, who was consecrated, according to Ware, in 1373, and died at Rome in 1378; and that the latter part of the statement is true is plain from the Annals of the Four Masters, in which the first entry under the year 1378 is that "Carbry O'Farrell, Bishop of Ardagh, a bond for the preservation of piety, the fostering of wisdom, and a vessel of Divine love and humanity, died at Rome."† Now the reader will find from a letter of Gregory XI., dated Avignon, April 28, 1374, here published,‡ that a Dominican friar named John, intervened between these two prelates. On the death of William Mac Casac, the chapter elected the friar John, above-named, to succeed him; and the election was approved by Milo, Archbishop of Armagh, who proceeded to the consecration. A question, however, was raised regarding it, in consequence of a Papal provision which had been made during the lifetime of the former bishop, William Mac Casac; and the whole case was referred to the Pope, who, in the letter referred to, confirms John in the possession of the See.

In the lists of the same diocese during the following century Ware gives the name of Cormac for the years 1460-70,§ but declares himself unable to say in what year this Cormac died. He places William O'Ferrall, however, as his successor in 1486. Now we find in Mgr. Theiner's collection|| the letter of confirmation of this William by Sixtus IV., dated August 4, 1479. But the predecessor of this William appears from the letter to have been not Cormac, but John; and the death of Bishop John seems to have occurred within the same year, for the

* Ware's "Bishops," p. 252-5. † "Annals," II., p. 671. ‡ "Theiner," p. 351.

§ Ware's "Bishops," p. 254.

|| P. 48.

Pope describes his appointment of William as *celerem ac felicem provisum*. We have not found, however, any indication of the family name, or of the date of the appointment of this William, the new prelate who is thus introduced into the series.

Again: in the catalogue of the same diocese at the year 1290-1322 Ware* places Matthew O'Heothy (probably O'Hoey); and, after the death of this prelate in 1322, Ware is unable to determine whether any successor was consecrated until 1331, in which year John Mageoi (or M'Geogh) succeeded; although he relates that one Alexander was appointed. Now, in the documents of the year 1322, Mgr. Theiner† prints a letter of John XXII., dated from Avignon on the 1st of August, and addressed to Robert, Bishop of Connor. This letter, however, is but the instrument of the translation of Robert from the see of Ardagh, which he had previously occupied, to that of Connor; nor do the letters contain any allusion by name whatever to the Alexander who is named by Ware as appointed in the interval between Bishops O'Hoey and M'Geogh. That the see of Connor, however, did not remain vacant during the interval, as Ware would imply, is clear from more than one indication in the Papal documents. Among the letters of 1324 is one from John XXII., authorizing the Bishop of Ardagh (not called by name) to borrow, on the security of his revenues, a sum of six hundred florins;‡ and in another letter of the same pontiff in 1326,§ addressed to several bishops in Ireland, for the purpose of soliciting a subsidy for the service of the Pope against the refractory Roman barons, the Bishop of Ardagh is included among the prelates to whom the appeal is made.

Among the least satisfactory portions of Ware's catalogue is that which regards the see of Ross, especially in the 14th century. From the year 1426, at which he gives the name of Cornelius Mac Elchade, down to 1494, when Edmund Courcey is set down, the only entries are the following:—"1488. One Thady was bishop of Ross on the 29th of January, 1488, and died a little after; but I have not found when he was consecrated." "One Odo [or Hugh] succeeded in 1489, and sat only five years. He died in 1494."||

Unhappily, the Vatican papers throw no light on the names of the occupants of the see between 1426 and 1488. In a commission of Pius II., dated May 26, 1460,¶ one of the judges appointed is the Bishop of Ross for the time, but his

* "Bishops," 252.

† P. 226.

‡ Theiner, p. 229.

§ P. 234. || Ware's "Bishops," p. 587.

¶ Theiner, p. 430.

name is not given. From a letter of Innocent VIII., however, dated July 20, 1488, we learn that the "Odo or Hugh," mentioned by Ware, was appointed by Sixtus IV., and therefore must have been bishop before 1485; and that the Thady whom Ware sets down as bishop in 1488, was not the lawful bishop of the see at all, but was intruded by fraud and violence, and in opposition to the sentence of a provincial synod of Cashel and the authority of the Holy See.* His family name was *Maccarryg* (Mac Carthy).

In his account of the see of Killaloe, Ware† professes himself unable to discover the reason of the deprivation of Robert Travers, whom he puts down as bishop from 1216 to 1221. The cause is fully explained in a letter of Honorius III., dated May 9, 1226. The chapter of the diocese had canonically elected another named David, and after a juridical examination, the election of David was confirmed by the Holy See.‡

Again, in the catalogue of the bishops of Clonmacnoise for the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, Ware§ describes Walter Blake as in possession of the see from 1487 till 1508, and after him places "one Thomas," adding, "and this is all I find regarding him." One of the letters in our collection resolves all the difficulty about the later history of this prelate. The letter to which we refer is addressed by Henry VIII. to Cardinal Giuglio de Medici, and commends to his Eminence "the venerable and religious man, brother Quintin O'Huygyn (O'Higgin), a man learned, prudent, and of approved life," praying of his Holiness that he would "deign to appoint and to set him as bishop over the church of Clonmacnoise, which is vacant by the translation of the Reverend Father Thomas, the late bishop, to the archbishopric of Tuam." Thomas, Bishop of Clonmacnoise, thus appears to be no other than Thomas O'Mullally, who was Archbishop of Tuam from 1515 till 1536; and this circumstance may, perhaps, account for the presence of his successor in Clonmacnoise, Father Quintin O'Higgin, at a synod which Archbishop O'Mullally held at Galway in 1520.||

The letter of the appointment of Father Quintin O'Higgin is accompanied by the record of the Consistorial inquisition in the case, which is so curious that we are induced to transcribe it entire, and in the curious language of the original Act:—

Igitur pro vera cause instructione, die 9 Novembris anno predicto Nicolaus Houran (Horan) clericus Hibernicus Hertfertensis diæc. testis ad hoc productus, interrogatus a me super qualitatibus D. fratris Quintini, medio

* Theiner, p. 503.
§ "Bishops," p. 174.

† P. 591.
|| Ware's "Bishops," p. 615.

‡ Pp. 25, 26.

juramento dixit, se eum nosse in Hybernia in provincia Tuamensi, et esse literis eruditum, predicatorem, bonis moribus et fama, aliisque multis virtutibus præditum.

De existentia vero ecclesiæ interrogatus, hæc respondit: In Hybernia insula orientem versus in provinciâ Tuamensi esse Cluenensem civitatem sitam inter sylvas, casarum ex palea et viminibus fere duodecim; a cujus parte levâ labitur fluvius qui eorum lingua Sinin appellatur; et distat a mare per iter unius diei.

A parte sinistra occidentem versus esse ecclesiam cathedralem pene dirutam, sine tecto, cum uno tantum altari parvo, stramine tecto, cum uno paramento vili, cruce ex aere, habens unum campanile cum duobus campanis, et parvam sacristiam; valoris triginta trium ducatorum, qui constant ex frumento et ordeo ex quo conficiuntur cervosa.—*Theiner*, p. 514.

The miserable condition of the see of Clonmacnoise and its cathedral may be easily explained from its frontier position, owing to which it had been for generations the debateable land between the eastern and western divisions of the kingdom, and the battle-field of the hostile races in their perpetually recurring conflicts.

A more just type of one of the minor sees of Ireland at the same time, which it is fair to place in contrast with this poverty-stricken hamlet of a dozen hovels of wicker-work and straw, and this dilapidated and roofless cathedral, with its single straw-covered altar, its one poor suit of vestments, and its crucifix of brass, is that of Ross, of which an account is given in the Consistorial process held previous to the confirmation of John Imurly, a Cistercian monk and abbot of the convent of St. Maur, in the county of Cork, who succeeded as Bishop of Ross on the resignation of Edmund Courcy in 1518. In the report of two witnesses, brother Richard, an Irish monk of the Cistercian order, and Maurice O'Cullinam, a priest of the diocese of Ross, who were examined upon oath, the cathedral town of Ross is described as situated on a plain near the sea; it contained about two hundred houses, and was enclosed with a wall; the surrounding district was fertile, well cultivated, and produced abundant crops of wheat; the cathedral church was a cruciform structure built "of living stone," with a timber roof covered with tiles; it had a nave and aisles, divided by pillars, and was about the size of Santa Maria del Popolo, in Rome. It had two doors, one in front and one at the side; the stalls were of wood and in the centre of the church; and the great altar stood at the head of the choir, at the left side of which was a sacristy, which was furnished with vestments, chalices of silver gilt, a mitre, and a silver crozier. In the adjoining cemetery stood a bell-tower with a large bell. The titular saint of the church was St.

Fachnan, whose festival was held on the vigil of the Assumption of our Lady. The chapter consisted of a dean, an archdeacon, a chancellor, and twelve canons, who recited the Divine office and celebrated a low mass daily, with a solemn mass on all festivals. Their residences were distributed through the diocese, which was but a day's journey (*una dieta*) in extent, the bishop's house being situated on the sea-shore, about half a mile outside of the city. It is added that the bishop enjoyed the right of collation to twenty-four benefices, and that the revenue of the see, which amounted to sixty marks, consisted of corn, tithes, and pasture-lands.

It would be curious to pursue these topographical and statistical sketches through the several dioceses, as well of the Pale as of the native Irish districts; but we regret to say that, from whatever cause, the consistorial acts of this collection are singularly defective, and the letters can hardly serve to supply the deficiency, as they seldom contain any descriptive particulars.

There is another point in reference to which we have gone through the papers with considerable interest—with a view to ascertain whether any light can be gathered from them on the singular statements with regard to a number of Irish ecclesiastics in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries, which are made in a "History of the Trinitarian Order in England, Scotland, and Ireland," written in Spanish by Fray Domingo Lopez, and published at Madrid in 1714. This author, in his account of the Order in Ireland, enumerates a long series of its notabilities, who at various times rose to eminence in the Church as bishops, archbishops, and cardinals, giving, in most cases, the most exact particulars as to place, time, circumstances, and even authorities. But the strange peculiarity of this catalogue, seemingly so circumstantial, is that, when tested by the commonly accepted records, it appears to be an utter fabrication, inasmuch as not only do not the names of the supposed bishops and archbishops appear in the received lists of the several sees, and particularly in the catalogue of Ware, but the various sees appear in almost every instance to have been occupied by other known bishops at the date to which Fray Domingo ascribes his supposed Trinitarian prelates. We conceived it possible that, as it occasionally happened that an appointment made in Ireland was set aside or not confirmed in Rome, or that, on the other hand, a Papal provision of a bishopric was not recognized by the Crown, the list of bishops named by Lopez might be reconciled with that of Ware upon the supposition of some such conflicting nominations.

With a view to test the feasibility of this mode of reconciliation, we have gone through the entire series. It is altogether so curious that, as the work is extremely rare, we are induced to cull out from the whole series, as it appears in the lengthy catalogue of the original (which is comprised in several chapters, and extends to many folio pages), the names of the several Irish Trinitarian dignitaries, with the date of each, as supplied by the author, or collected from his narrative :—

I. CARDINALS.

William Goldeo (Goold), Archbishop of Dublin, 1296.

Robert Geraldino, Archbishop of Armagh, 1369.

Zacharias Patricio, Bishop of Meath (*Mindense*, clearly for *Midense*), 1420.

II. ARCHBISHOPS.

James Dirse, Armagh, 1239.

Richard Hurley, Archbishop of Damascus and Coadjutor of Dublin, 1258.

Robert Uvario, Dublin, 1270.

Stephen Fulburne, Bishop of Waterford and Archbishop of Tuam, 1281.

Edward O'Brien, Cashel, 1294.

Walter de Failghia, Tuam, 1308.

Peter Butler, Cashel, 1230.

III. BISHOPS.

William de Burgho, Down, 1239.

Daniel Lynch, Killaloe, 1289.

Nicholas Gordon, Cork, 1271.

Malachy Roche, Ferns, 1285.

Robert Butler, Ross, 1265.

Cornelius Uylopp, Kildare, 1336.

Richard Rocomb, or Bokum, Leighlin, 1420.

Robert Lynch, Ferns, 1285.*

Now, at first sight, this enumeration of archbishops and bishops presents no striking improbability; and although the statement as to the three cardinals of the Irish nation is at variance with the received impression of historians, yet it is not in itself incredible. But strange and almost incredible as it will appear, there is no more shadow of authority for the catalogue in the Papal documents of Mgr. Theiner's collection than appears in the more purely domestic records on which Ware and the other historians have relied. Not one of the three

* The title of the work, which is extremely rare, is "Noticias Historicas de las tres Florentissimas Provincias del celeste Orden de la Santissima Trinidad Redempcion de Canteros en Inglaterra, Escocia, y Irlanda. Su Author el M. R. P. M. Fr. Domingo Lopez, &c., &c. Folio. Madrid, 1714." A copy of this history was bequeathed to the Library of Maynooth College by the late President of the College, Dr. Renehan, by whom attention was first called to this extraordinary catalogue of bishops and archbishops.

cardinals can be traced in any of the records; and of the seven archbishops and eight bishops enumerated by Fray Domingo, only the two whose names we have printed in *italics*—Stephen Fulburne, Bishop of Waterford and afterwards Archbishop of Tuam, and Richard Rocomb (or, as it is written by others, Bokum), Bishop of Leighlin,—appear either in Ware or in the Roman documents. The rest are not only not positively recorded at the dates to which Fray Domingo assigns them, but for the most part are positively excluded by the authentic records of the date, which in several cases, as well in Theiner* as in Ware, show different names in occupation of the sees; and do not in a single instance, so far as we have been able to discover, lend any support to the account of the Trinitarian annalist. We cannot help regarding it as one of the most perplexing of literary puzzles.

On the whole the papers of this collection throw much less light than might be expected on the relations of the English and native races in Ireland. With the exception of the letters already cited, and some others conceived in a similar spirit of sympathy with the sufferings of the oppressed Celtic population, there is little that bears upon the subject at all. We have looked in vain for any trace of the retaliatory measures of some of the Irish bishops, which are known to have taken place about the middle of the thirteenth century, and which drew from Rome the same deprecatory judgment as to their uncharitable and unworthy spirit, with which we have seen the Popes condemn the intolerant exclusiveness of the English clergy in Ireland. But we cannot help recognizing, in a contest which arose towards the close of the fifteenth century, and in which Sixtus IV. interposed by a letter printed by Mgr. Theiner,† the working of the same antipathies in which the provisions of Kilkenny had their origin. On the death, in 1479, of John Bolcomp, Bishop of Waterford and Lismore, an Irish Cistercian, named Nicholas O'Henisa (O'Hennessy), was appointed by Sixtus IV. to succeed to the united sees. It would appear from the letter of Sixtus, that the appointment was freely acquiesced in by the clergy and people of Lismore; but the Chapter of Waterford, and the clergy and laity of the city, among the latter of whom are specially com-

* We would refer particularly to a letter of Nicholas III. in 1279 ("Theiner," 118), to John de Derlinton, a friar of the Dominican order, confirming his election to the See of Dublin. The facts disclosed in this letter, which it would occupy too much space to detail, effectually shut out all possibility of the truth of Lopez's statement as to Cardinal William Gould or Robert Uvario having held that See at the dates to which he (Lopez) assigns them.

† Pp. 487-8.

memorated two of unmistakable English race, James Risse (Rice) and John Bottiller (Butler), resisted the nomination upon several grounds, one of which was that O'Hennessey was ignorant of the English language. The purport of the Pope's letter, which is addressed to the Archbishop of Cashel, is to compel the submission of the recusants.

Still less is there to throw light on the relations of the Irish Church with the general affairs of Christendom during these centuries. But there are occasional indications in the letters from which we gather that Ireland was not altogether shut out from the general concerns of the Church. There is one very startling letter of Benedict XII., addressed, November 6, 1335,* to King Edward III., from which we learn that about that time an attempt was made to propagate in Ireland a heresy of a very strange and revolting character, and for which it is difficult to discover any exact parallel among the errors which are known to have prevailed on the Continent of Europe at the same period. These plainly anti-Christian sectaries are described by the Pope as blasphemously asserting "that Christ was a sinful man, and had been justly crucified;" as "maintaining heterodox opinions with regard to the sacrament of the Body of Christ, and denying that it is lawful to adore It;" as "refusing due obedience to the apostolic decrees and mandates;" and even as "rendering homage and offering sacrifice to demons." Beyond the statements in this letter there is not, so far as we can discover, any further allusion to these sectaries in the volume; but the subject is one which will deserve to be carefully examined. Possibly the heresy may have been an offshoot of some of the semi-Manichean sects which appear at intervals in various parts of the Church from the twelfth century downwards.

Benedict's letter is dated from Avignon. During the Papal residence at this city, the intercourse of the Irish bishops with the Popes continued uninterrupted, and there are several letters,† from which we gather that levies of money were made in Ireland during that time for the relief of the necessities of the Holy See. We even find the Pope, John XXII., communicating with the Archbishop of Armagh on the subject of his conflict with Lewis of Bavaria.‡

That Ireland during the Western schism adhered to the obedience of Urban was already well known. There are several letters of Urban VI., from which it may be inferred that the contest excited no small degree of interest, and that the support of the Irish clergy was actively enlisted on the

* Theiner, p. 269.

† See p. 233.

‡ P. 229.

side which they had espoused. Nor did this interest cease till the final determination of the contest. When the convocation of the Council of Pisa was resolved upon, John, Bishop of Waterford and Lismore, appears as commissioner of Gregory XII. in Ireland for the purpose.* In 1413, at the approach of the date fixed for summoning a new Council on the same subject, John XXIII. writes to the four archbishops, and through them to their suffragans, to intimate the intended convocation, and to require their presence in the beginning of the month of November, at a fitting place, to be announced to them within three months from the date of the letter;† and even so late as 1423, we find Martin V. writing to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Winchester to complain of some proceedings taken by the Archbishop of Dublin, the Bishop of Ferns, and others in Ireland, tending to the advancement of the cause of the schism, and to the infringement of the rights and liberties of the See of Rome.‡

Considering the supposed isolation of Ireland during this period, one is still more surprised to meet with a letter written very soon after the Turkish capture of Constantinople, for the purpose of organising a contribution in Ireland for the support of Christian interests in the East against the Turks. It is addressed to John Bole, Archbishop of Armagh.§

It is beyond our purpose to enter at much length into the letters of Henry VIII., which are contained in this collection. Both as regards the progress of the change of the relations of the English Church towards the Holy See, which took place under that king, and the causes and motives of that change, and as regards the history of the negotiations in the matter of the divorce, they are deserving of an examination too minute, and they open up questions too comprehensive to be dealt with in the space which remains at our disposal. The papers on the marriage question are confined to the years 1528-32, and comprise with others the long and important Report of Cardinal Campeggio. Perhaps it should rather be called his correspondence, as it consists of a series of reports, written from day to day, commencing at Paris November 29th, 1528, and concluding with a letter from the same city, written on the legate's homeward journey, November 8th, 1529. The letters are all in Italian, and are addressed to Salviati, the Pope's secretary. They fill twenty-two folio pages.

We need hardly say that these letters abound with interesting details, upon which we would gladly dwell. But we only find space to refer to two of the letters of the King

* P. 368.

+ P. 369.

‡ P. 371.

§ P. 402.

himself, chiefly as illustrating what has already been repeatedly alleged—that the decision of the Pope on the divorce question was the real turning-point in Henry's career as a Church reformer, and that he was quite ready, had the Pope yielded in this particular, to maintain his dutiful relations with Rome unbroken and unmodified. These letters, like the reports of Campeggio, are unpublished; and the first of them is especially curious, inasmuch as in the State-Papers of Henry VIII., published by Mr. Robert Lemon, is found a letter written by the King on the very same day and the very same subject, but addressed, not to the Pope, but to the King's agents at Rome, Bennet and Carne. It is interesting to compare the demands of the principal with the instructions which he gives to his agents as to the tenor of their demands. The former, of course, are naturally more reserved; but the spirit in each case is substantially the same; and from both it is abundantly plain that, even at this late period of the negotiation, there needed but a convenient degree of pliancy on the part of Clement in the matter of the divorce, in order to secure Henry in his allegiance to Rome. As both the letters to which we refer were written while he was still a suitor and a suppliant, the alternative is not so distinctly and so formally put before the Pontiff as it might be presented by an independent negociator; but we think no one can possibly misunderstand the half threat, half promise which lurks behind the words which we have printed in *italics* in the following extract from a letter, dated December 6th, 1530:—

But with us your Holiness must act in such a manner as not to transgress the laws of nature; and, if you desire your own rights to be preserved inviolate, do not encroach on ours; do not receive appeals made to you in causes which are ours; and, if you have received any, do not, contrary to justice, try to examine them, but, according to justice, send them back to the kingdom; do not strive to make use of your inhibitions in this cause against us or our subjects, who should not be intimidated in this way. Let the laws and prerogatives of our kingdom of England, which are inferior to your own neither in point of time or authority, take their course. If you have made any inhibitions, which we do not believe, recall on mature deliberation what has been done, and do not issue any more hereafter to the prejudice of the rights of others. In a word, what we desire is, that you should not suffer to be referred to you or the Roman Court the trial of a cause which ought to be terminated within the limits of our kingdom. Nor should your Holiness imagine that, while this our kingdom of England has fixed and certain laws, that no cause whatever, touching in any way the Royal person or the State, should be tried outside the limits of the kingdom, we will either permit them to be infringed or violated during our reign, or that the nobles of our kingdom will suffer so grave a prejudice to be brought upon this kingdom.

In short, if the person of the petitioner makes no impression on you, at least let the cause of petition move you. For we ask a thing which is in accordance with the natural law, that we may strive to preserve our rights inviolate. We ask, with the authority of the Sacred Councils, that of your own laws, that each cause should be terminated in its own province; we ask according to the opinion of Saints Cyprian and Bernard, to whom, as I mentioned, this seemed just: finally, we ask what our laws will not suffer to be otherwise. And we are averse to contention. Your Holiness cannot certainly refuse to agree to them, if you have that fervour of charity which your high dignity supposes, and which we also desire. If, however, these causes for asking are not sufficient to move your Holiness to grant what is just, *they will have sufficient weight with us to prevent our suffering at the hands of your Holiness what is unjust.* No one easily suffers his property to be taken, and we are also unwilling to invade another's rights; but contention is not unattended with loss, and disputes once raised are arranged with scarcely any one's advantage. We beg that your Holiness would please signify by letter what your opinion is, and what reply you have determined to make. We wish every happiness to your Holiness, to whom we most humbly recommend ourselves.

From our Palace at Hampton Court, this sixth day of December, 1530.

Your Holiness' most devout and most submissive Son, King of England and France, Def. of the Faith, and Lord of Ireland,
HENRY.*

The letter of the King to Bennet and Carne, published in the State papers,† is also dated Dec. 6th, 1531. It does not contain any allusion to the letter simultaneously addressed directly to the Pope, but the King directs them to resist in every way the withdrawal of the case from England to Rome, against which he himself argues so earnestly.

After the lapse of several months, consumed in fruitless negotiation, Clement wrote to Henry a letter couched in most conciliatory language, and promising to do everything which justice and religion would permit in furtherance of the wishes of the King. To this letter Henry rejoined in a document which reproduces, almost in the same form, the significant warning conveyed in the extract already given:—

The frequent mention of justice by your Holiness, at one time in words at another by letter, has moved us in a singular manner, and has made us disclose the state of our mind in a more free and familiar manner to your Holiness, who seem from your words to court our friendship, and to whose person and dignity we always in justice and truth wish well. First, it is too much that your judges of the Rota arrogate to themselves that, of their own sole authority, they should pronounce judgment, disregarding, in matters which are controverted, and which concern princes, the opinions of academicians and most learned men. It is a yoke which free men could never endure in any state,

* Theiner, p. 596.

† Vol. VII., p. 169.

that judgment should be passed at the will of dictators, to the disregard of the laws which give authority. Our council and yours have the same books ; the interpreters are the same. Who should not then despise and condemn the unjust decision passed by your judges, since it has been censured by the learned, and depends on authority alone ? We, as far as we can, provide for and foresee *future events*, which, indeed, much disturb us who have learned neither to suffer nor inflict injury ; and since our wishes are ineffectual, *we try this, as a last and extreme measure*. Let, then, your Holiness bear in mind what it behoves you to remember on every ground ; consider the beginning and progress of our cause ; weigh its justice, and attend to what has been done. The sole assertion of the Queen renders our kingdom suspected as a fitting place for the trial of the cause, lest judgment should not be freely given, because, forsooth, the judges are influenced by fear of our displeasure. And nevertheless, though the Emperor esteems this cause his own, and defends it as his own, yet in a place where all are in his interests, or are with reason in fear of his friends, they, as it were, hanging over their necks,—we are summoned thither—we are cited, that, with the greatest prejudice of our honour, we may stand our trial. All England, it is horrible to think, is set aside as having no one worthy to act as judge ; and thus the whole clergy is rejected in a body ; they are esteemed to have no regard for God ; they are unfit to handle so important a matter, because, forsooth, they are men—because they are Englishmen ; while, nevertheless, judgment will be passed at Rome, neither by angels, nor by those who have less reverence, love, or fear for the Emperor than our subjects entertain for us, who have always given the fullest liberty to the truth. And yet these things, when they are done, are adorned under the name of justice. We appeal to the conscience of your Holiness, not in as much as, through regard for dignity, it yields to the judgments of others, but as right reason itself, the offspring of truth, should direct it. We are separated from Rome by the sea and mountains, and nevertheless we are cited to Rome—although it is a thing unheard of in our land that a king was ever cited to Rome. If it had been arranged that the cause should be decided at Avignon, which is half the journey, and is neutral, in that case, although all would not have been satisfied, some, nevertheless, would not have blamed it so much, as this is frequently done in the causes even of inferior persons. But to be summoned to Rome, where you can neither go with security, nor send documents without danger of losing them, is, in the case even of a private person, hard ; but in that of a prince, utterly intolerable. There is a rule in all things, and there are certain limits which whoever passes certainly creates great danger for himself that his measures will come to nought and completely fail. Justice is no less justice because we do not ask that to be done which ought to be done. See what is just : let there be a limit in the exercise of authority, on which those whom we have spoken of may agree ; lest otherwise you may pull down and not build. Whatever your Holiness does in our regard, we entreat you, at least for our ancient friendship, that you first of all ascertain it to be so just that all may estimate, not the justice from the power, but the power from the justice. If justice will be esteemed, it will easily of itself be known to all, and what will be done will obtain the name of justice ; but if it happen otherwise, and if it be defended as just because it has been done at Rome by

those who contend that they can with absolute power give at pleasure a form to justice, certainly a great cause of offence will be generated ; as, not to say more, the clear and constant truth of what has no light force of persuasion and stops the mouths of all who speak against it, conquers even unconquered, when it is most oppressed. The recollection of our ancient friendship, which we would with great regret see in any manner interrupted, and desire to see preserved in justice, has drawn this from us. If we defend what is our own, we but make use of the law of nature, even with the offence of others, as is allowed to all. *We will act with unwillingness if we do anything, as we should not wish anything to happen which would lead to contention ; and in this our conscience will rejoice,* for it will have this subject of consolation that, to whomsoever evil and annoyance may come, it is certainly free from all fault. *It is, therefore, in the power of your Holiness either to alienate us unworthily, or to restrain us in our duty, and so attach us by benefits.* The vicissitudes of hope and desperation are mutual, as they occasion great anxiety of mind, *lest that may happen which we do not wish, and what we expect may succeed too late.* Mr. William Benet and our other advocates, to whom we beg most earnestly you would give undoubted faith, will communicate our further wishes to your Holiness. And may your Holiness prosper, to whom we most humbly recommend ourselves.

Given in our Palace of Greenwich, 28th day of December, 1531.

Your Holiness' most devout and most submissive Son, by the grace
of God King of England and France, Def. of the Faith, and
Lord of Ireland,

HENRY.*

It will be observed that neither of these letters contains any information of the intended appeal to a general council which about this time began to be held out on Henry's part, for the purpose of compelling the compliance of Clement, to whom that project was supposed to be for the time especially distasteful. The State Papers already referred to contain, among the documents of 1532, three letters of Henry,† all written on the same day (Feb. 29th), and addressed to Ghinucci, Clement, and Carne, in the last of which the King's agents are instructed to make use of this menace, should the Pope persist in the withdrawal of the case to Rome.

We wish it was possible to pursue this comparison, but our allotted space is already more than exhausted. We cannot however, conclude without repeating the hope with which we began, that the volume of which we now take leave may prove but the first instalment of Mgr. Theiner's contribution to materials for Irish history. The present collection indeed breaks off at the period which is really the most critical in the history of

* Vol. VII., pp. 350-63.

† P. 358.

the Catholic Church in Ireland, and that for the full and truthful elucidation of which we must rely almost entirely on the archives in the Vatican, if, indeed, the missing materials are to be found even there. The Irish Catholics, under Edward VI., Elizabeth, and James I., have a history for which no domestic records exist; or, rather, in reference to which the domestic records which are preserved are utterly unreliable, as coming, not alone from an enemy, but from an unscrupulous and untruthful enemy. The Carew and Carte manuscripts represent, for the most part, only the views of one side and one interest. We saw lately, too, in reference to a Report from Ireland which Mr. Froude paraded with all the solemnity of a State Paper, the small degree of reliance which can safely be placed on many of the narratives of Irish affairs during this period which have hitherto been accepted as history; and it is time that an effort should be made to present the other side of the picture,—the history of the time as it appears in the narratives of the Irish Catholics themselves and of those who felt and wrote in their interest, and who understood their feelings, their views, and their position. For this we are to look mainly to Rome;—probably also to Simancas and to Brussels, but certainly first of all to Rome. It may be, and most probably it will be, that these reports will be found prejudiced in an equal degree on the opposite side; but even an opportunity of comparison will prove a valuable aid to the discovery of truth: and, at all events, there are few possible contributions to British and Irish history, which we should welcome with so much satisfaction as a volume of the Vatican papers of Edward VI., Elizabeth, and James I.

ART. V.—CONSALVI'S MEMOIRS.

Mémoires du Cardinal Consalvi, Secrétaire d'Etat du Pape Pie VII., avec une Introduction et des Notes. Par J. CRÉTINEAU-JOLY. 2 vols; 8vo. Paris : Plon. 1864.

M. CRÉTINEAU-JOLY is a Vendéan, and there seems to be in his blood something of that pugnacious and warlike quality which so distinguished his forefathers. Each of his former publications betrays this combative propensity, and the introduction which accompanies Cardinal Consalvi's Memoirs is worthy of its predecessors. M. Crétineau-Joly is well known on the Continent by his "History of the Jesuits"—a work containing a considerable amount of valuable information concerning that celebrated and much-maligned order: but, at the same time, it may be considered in the light of an Armstrong gun, which batters and reduces to dust the bastions of an enemy. Indeed, it was ushered forth at the very height of the warfare which raged against the Church in France, a few years previous to the downfall of Louis Philippe. In 1858 the same writer produced a brochure bearing the following title—*The Church versus the Revolution*—another broadside fired against crowned revolutionists, no less than against the sectarian hordes of a Mazzini and a Garibaldi. Hardly a year had elapsed when the French Emperor invaded Lombardy, with what result the whole world is aware. So M. Crétineau-Joly had taken time by the forelock. And now, again, he comes forth with these highly-interesting and authentic memoirs, written by the Cardinal and Prime Minister of Pius VII. In every respect they may be proclaimed the most important, if not the most voluminous, of the editor's publications. No one, at the same time, will fail to perceive that between the actual situation of the Holy See and that which marked its history in the eventful years between 1799 and 1811, there underlies a startling similarity. Singularly enough, the second half of the nineteenth century begins with the same picture of violence, the same hypocrisy, the same contempt of right by might, that characterized the dawn of the present age. On the one side, an all-powerful ruler, intoxicated by success, backed by a host of servile demagogues, and hardly less servile, though royal infidels; on the other, a weak old man, backed by a calm, deliberate, truly Christian genius—both wielding no

other weapons but Faith, Hope, and Charity—both torn from their home and judgment-seat by the iron hand of revolutionary despotism—and yet both riding triumphant over the seething waves, whilst the grim corpses of their enemies are washed to the shore, or startle the traveller as he comes suddenly upon them in his wanderings through Russian wilds. Aye, there she goes, that tiny ship of Peter's, with a Pius at her helm; now, as in bygone days, with an Antonelli as commander—much about the same man as a Consalvi.

Blow fair, thou breeze! She anchors ere the dark.
 Already doubled is the cape—our bay
 Receives that prow which proudly spurns the spray.
 How gloriously her gallant course she goes!
 Her white wings flying—never from her foes—
 She walks the waters like a thing of life,
 And seems to dare the elements to strife.

Setting aside metaphors and poetry, these memoirs are certainly one of the most remarkable instances of calm self-possession and confidence in a just cause that are to be met with in any time or country. Here is a man, and prime minister of a captive sovereign, himself a prisoner, who undertakes to write the history of the important events in which he had played a most conspicuous part. He is closely watched, and consequently obliged to write by fits and starts; he is deprived of every source of documentary information, and consequently must trust to his own memory. Will these hasty, yet truthful, sheets escape his jailor's eye?—He cannot tell. Will he ever recover his liberty, be restored to his dear master's bosom and confidence?—He cannot tell: but nevertheless the great Cardinal—for *great* he was universally acknowledged—goes on bringing forth certain facts, known to himself alone, and which throw more light on the true character of the first Napoleon than the ponderous and garbled evidence of a Thiers, or even the more trustworthy pages of M. Artaud, in his "Life of Pius VII." Indeed, there are few comparisons of higher interest than to open those two works at the parts which refer to the events narrated in these memoirs. A labour of this kind, first originating in a spirit of fair-play, soon becomes a labour of love, so strong is the contrast between the worldly, scheming, truckling, infidel historian of the first Empire, and the unassuming and conscientious, though bold and resolute, Cardinal. One may safely say, that M. Thiers would have never dreamt of bearding the headstrong Bonaparte, as Consalvi did on a memorable occasion, which reminds us of those legates of old, who daunted by their steady looks and unruffled

patience the burly violence of a Richard, or unveiled the cunning of a Frederic Hohenstauffen.

At the very outset of these memoirs, the Cardinal gives us their true and solemn character. His last will, which accompanies them, and may be considered as a sort of preface, contains the following lines :—

My heir and trustee, as well as those who may hereafter take charge of my inheritance, are bound to bestow the greatest care on my personal writings relative to the Conclave held at Venice in 1799 and 1800, to the Concordat of 1801, to the marriage of the Emperor Napoleon with the Archduchess Maria-Louisa of Austria ; and, lastly, to the papers on different periods of my life and ministry. These five papers, some of which are nearly finished, and the others in course of preparation, are not to be published before the death of those eminent personages who are mentioned therein. In this way many disputes may be avoided ; for, though utterly unfounded, as my own writings rest on truth alone, still they might injure that very truth, and the interests of the Holy See, to which I am desirous of leaving the means of repelling any false attack published hereafter on these matters. These memoirs on the Conclave, the Concordat of 1801, the marriage, and the ministry, belonging more especially to the Holy See and to the Pontifical Government, my heir and trustee shall present them to the reigning Pontiff, and beseech the Holy Father to preserve them carefully within the archives at the Vatican. They may be of use to the Holy See on many occasions, but more particularly if any future history be published of the events which form the object of the present writings, or if it should become necessary to refute any false statement. In regard to the memoirs concerning the different periods of my own life, as the extinction of my family will leave behind me no one directly interested in the following pages, they are to remain in the hands of my heir and trustee, or in those of the successive administrators of my fortune ; or, again, they may be likewise handed over to the archives of the Vatican, if they be deemed worthy of preservation. My only desire is, that in case of the biography of the Cardinals being continued, my heir and executors shall cause these memoirs to be known, so that nothing may be published contrary to truth about myself ; for I am ambitious of maintaining immaculate my own reputation—a wish grounded on the prescriptions of Scripture. As for the truth of the facts brought forward in my writings, I may make bold to say, *Deus scit quia non mentior*.

Cardinal Consalvi was born at Rome, of a noble family, in 1757, and was the eldest of five children, two of whom died at an early age. His father bore the title of Marquess, and his mother, the Marchioness Claudia Carandini, was of Modenese origin.

The family itself, on the father's side, had sprung up in Tuscany, at Pisa, though not under the same name ; but emigrated about a century and a half ago to the Roman States, where it expanded, and gradually grew into political,

or rather ecclesiastical, importance. Consalvi's forefathers still, however, held in Tuscany some property, to which he would have been entitled, had he felt disposed to dispute the equity of certain Leopoldine laws concerning trustees. But, with characteristic disinterestedness, the future Cardinal never gave the matter a second thought.

I never felt (says he) a passion for riches : besides, my resources, though far from opulent, were sufficient for a modest way of living, thanks to the income arising out of the different offices which I held successively. And thus being lifted, by Divine Providence, above vanity and ambition, I never was tempted to prove that I was descended from the Brunaccis and not from the Consalvis, whenever envy or ignorance represented me as belonging to a stock unblessed with old nobility. It would have been an easy matter to dispel these imputations or errors. Being fully convinced that the best nobility springs from the heart and from good deeds ; knowing, likewise, that I was a genuine Brunacci and not a Consalvi, I despised all such rumours. . . Nor did I alter my views when the high position which I afterwards attained afforded so many opportunities for putting an end to those idle reports.

In the above passage we have already the whole man. During his long and chequered life he never once exposed himself to the charge of making his own fortune out of the numerous and even honourable occasions which would have tempted a less exalted soul. It would be useless to follow the young Consalvi through his course of studies, which were brilliant, and partly gone through under the eye of Cardinal York, the last of a fated race, who entertained for the future minister an affectionate friendship that never cooled until his death.

Hercules Consalvi had hardly finished his academical curriculum at Rome when he was called to the prelature, in 1783, as reporter to the tribunal of the Curia. His talents and deep knowledge, though so young, in canon and civil law, soon made him conspicuous among his competitors. In 1786, the Pope Pius VI. appointed him *Ponente del buono Governo*, a board, or congregation, charged with giving its opinion on all municipal questions. This promotion was due to his merit, but the Cardinal himself confesses that it was a tardy one, not on account of any neglect on the part of the Pontifical Government, but merely because he did not avail himself of favourable opportunities. "On the one hand," observes he, "my own disposition never inclined to ask for favour, and still less to court the patronage of those placed in high positions ; whilst, on the other hand, I had before my eyes, in such respects, the fine example of my own guardian, the Cardinal Negroni. . . . He was wont to say, 'We never ought to ask

for anything; we must never flatter to obtain preferment; but manage in such a way as to overcome every obstacle, through a most punctual fulfilment of our duties, and the enjoyment of a sound reputation.' To this piece of advice I strictly adhered through life." To those who are so prone to malign the pomp and splendour of the Roman prelature, it will be a matter of surprise to learn that at this very time the only benefice conferred upon Consalvi amounted to the paltry stipend of £12 a year.

The Pope, however, who seems to have been an excellent judge of true merit, soon placed the young prelate at the head of the Hospital of San Michele, the largest and most important in Rome. The establishment required a thorough reform: and Consalvi soon worked wonders, being led on by his own innate ardour, and by a strong predilection for the management of charitable institutions. But he had hardly realized his intended labour of reformation, when he was superseded by another prelate. Pius VI., in fact, did not wish Consalvi to wear out his energies in the routine of administrative bureaucracy. The incident which led to his promotion is so truly characteristic of both personages, that we cannot refrain from a copious quotation:—

The sudden death of one of the *votanti di segnatura*, or Supreme Court of Cassation, made a vacancy in that court. All my friends engaged me not to lose a moment in applying for it. I did not yield to their entreaties, nor, indeed, did the Pope allow me time for that purpose. The above death had taken place on Maunday Thursday. The very next morning, though it was Good Friday, and the sacred services of the day were about to be solemnized; though all the public offices were closed, according to custom, the Pope sent to the Secretary of State an order to forward my immediate appointment as *votante di segnatura*. As soon as it arrived, I hastened to the Pope to thank him. His Holiness was not in the habit of receiving any one merely for the sake of hearing expressions of gratitude; still less did I expect to be introduced on such a day, when the Pope, after attending at the holy function, had retired to his apartments, with a view of coming back for *Tenebræ*, and was in the very act of reciting Complin, which was to be followed by his dinner.

On learning that I was in the antechamber, where he had previously given orders that I should not be sent away in case I should come, he admitted me at once. After finishing Complin in my presence, he addressed me so kindly that I shall remember his words as long as I live. "My dear Monsignor," said he, "you are well aware that we receive no one merely to hear thanksgivings; and yet we have gone against our usual custom, notwithstanding this busy day, and though our dinner has just been served up, in order that we may have the pleasure of making you the present communication. If you were not included in the last promotion, it was because we

were obliged to hand over to another the post really destined to yourself ; and in doing so we felt as much aggrieved as we are now delighted to offer you immediately the vacant charge of *votante di segnatura*. We do it to show you the satisfaction which you afford us by your conduct. We took you away from an administrative station merely to place you on higher ground."

The Holy Father then added a few words concerning the opinion which his kindness, and by no means my own merit, suggested to him relatively to my future career. Indeed, the knowledge which I have of myself would not allow me to transcribe those words. He then continued as follows :—"What we now bestow upon you is really not worth much, but I have nothing else for the present. Take it, however, as a positive pledge of what I am disposed to do as soon as an opportunity offers."

It is easy to understand that after such a speech, uttered in that easy, affable, and yet majestic manner so peculiar to Pius VI., I was at a loss for expressions to answer him. I could hardly stammer out, that after the language he had just used about my promotion—language showing that I had not incurred his disapproval by my conduct at San Michele—my mind was quite at ease as to the future. Indeed, I had no other ambition but to please him, and to fulfil my duty in any station he might think fit to confer upon me.

Here I was interrupted. "I am satisfied—nay, highly satisfied"—said the Pope, "by your behaviour at San Michele ; but I again say that I destine you to other purposes. What I promised formerly was sincere, but still it was but empty words. This is something matter of fact ; not much, indeed, but yet better than words. So don't refuse it ; and now be off, for, you see, our dinner is getting cold, and we must soon go back to chapel."

It would be doubtless congenial to our feelings to dwell upon these touching details ; but we are already in the year 1790, and the knell of the old French monarchy is tolling. Let us plunge, therefore, at once *in medias res*, and skip over the eight intervening years between the time which saw Rome invaded by a revolutionary army, the Pope torn from his throne, and led a prisoner, first to Florence, then to Valence, where he was to die a martyr. On reading this part of the Memoirs, one is particularly struck with the similarity which it presents with the history of Piedmontese invasion—the same hypocrisy, the same attempts at provoking to insurrection the inhabitants at Rome, and, these failing, the same recourse to violence. The accidental death of General Duphot at last appears in its true colours, but of course it supplied the Directory with a pretence for seizing the Papal States, an act of spoliation it had been long preparing.* Thanks to the

* As a proof of this, we may produce the secret instructions forwarded two months and a half before the general's death and the Roman insurrection, by the French Government to Joseph Bonaparte, their plenipotentiary at Rome :—"You have two things to bear in mind : (1) To prevent the King

energy of Consalvi, to whom had been entrusted the maintenance of public order, previous to the entry of the French troops into the capital, no insurrection took place; but for that very reason he was obnoxious to the government of the invaders. After the Pope's departure he was thrown into prison, with the prospect of being transported, together with many Roman ecclesiastical and Pontifical officers, to the fatal colony of Cayenne. To the honour of the French commander it must be said, that he did all in his power to defend the energetic prelate against his contemptible enemies, and to alleviate his captivity. The Paris Directory had first banished him to Civita Vecchia, and then altered his destination to Naples. But the Roman demagogues were determined upon wreaking their vengeance on Consalvi:—

I had been detained (says he) about four or five and twenty days, when I was visited in my prison by my dear brother Andrea, as well as by my two friends, the Princes Chigi and Teano. This piece of good fortune I owed to the kind commander of the fortress. They informed me that they were bearers of both good and bad news. I was at last to be transported, not, indeed, to Tuscany, but to Naples, so that I might not join the Pope. At the same time, it had been ordained that I was to ride through the streets of the city mounted on an ass, escorted by policemen, and lashed all along with a horsewhip. Many a window under which I was to pass by was already hired; and our Jacobins, as well as the wives of our Consuls, promised themselves much pleasure at the sight of this execution. My friends were quite amazed at my indifference on receiving this last piece of news, which, indeed, caused me but little pain; for I really considered it rather as a source of triumph and glory. On the contrary, I was deeply vexed at not being able to proceed to Tuscany, where I was so desirous of meeting the Pope.

The humanity of the French general prevented the Roman demagogues from carrying into execution the latter part of the sentence; but he remained inflexible as to Consalvi's removal to Naples. The latter had, therefore, but to obey;

of Naples from coming to Rome; (2) To help, instead of opposing, the favourable dispositions of those who believe that it is time for the Papal dominion to come to an end. In short, you must encourage the impulse towards freedom by which the people of Rome seems to be animated." Instructions like these (observes, very justly, M. Crétineau-Joly) could have no other object but to lay a diplomatical snare, or to provoke an insurrection. The fact is so clear that Cacaull, who succeeded to Joseph Bonaparte at Rome, wrote in 1801 to the First Consul—"You know, quite as well as I do, the details of this melancholy event. Nobody in Rome ordered either to fire or to kill any one. General Duphot was imprudent; nay, more—let us out with the word—he was guilty. There is a law of nations at Rome not a whit less than elsewhere." The admission does credit to the honest man who contributed so largely to bring about the Concordat of 1801.

and started for his destination, in company with a band of eighteen convicts, and several political prisoners like himself. After many difficulties, arising out of Acton's tortuous policy, he succeeded at length in reaching Leghorn, where he had to encounter obstacles of a different nature. His very first step was to proceed to Florence, in hopes that the Duke of Tuscany would facilitate his access to the captive Pontiff, who was detained in a neighbouring Carthusian monastery. But the jealous watchfulness of the French plenipotentiary struck terror into the heart of the Tuscan minister, who peremptorily refused to have anything to do with the matter. Consalvi was not, however, to be daunted when on the path of duty; he consequently set out on foot for the Chartreuse, situated at about three miles from Florence, and contrived his visit so secretly that he baffled detection. On approaching the foot of the hill, the faithful servant could hardly repress his emotions. But let us hear him in his own words:—

Every step which brought me nearer to the Holy Father increased the strong feelings that welled up from my soul. The poverty and solitude of the place, the sight of the two or three unfortunates who attended him, brought tears to my eyes. At last I was introduced into his presence. O God! what were my emotions at that moment; my heart throbbed almost to breaking!

Pius VI. was seated before a table, a posture which concealed his weakness, for he had almost lost the use of his legs, and he could not move without the help of two strong men. The beauty and majesty of his features were still the same as at Rome; he still inspired a deep veneration and a most ardent attachment. I fell prostrate at his feet, which I bathed with my tears; I told him the difficulties I had to encounter, and how ardently I desired to remain with him, in order to serve him, assist him—in fact, share his fate. I promised not to spare any effort for the furtherance of this object.

A full hour quickly fled in thus communing with each other, and Consalvi was obliged to take his leave. The aged Pope foresaw that this prop of his declining and martyred life would not be allowed him; but still he clung fondly to the idea, and when his faithful adherent, on a second and last visit, admitted that he had failed in every endeavour to gain his end, and had even been ordered out of the country, Pius evinced a strong feeling of regret, though no surprise. This farewell visit is related in terms no less touching than the former:—

During this audience, which lasted also a full hour, he bestowed upon me the greatest marks of kindness, exhorting me successively to practise resignation, wisdom, and those acts of firmness of which his own life and his whole demeanour set such a fine example. He appeared to me quite as great,

and even far greater, than when he reigned at Rome. I besought him to give me his blessing. He laid his hands on my head, and, like the most venerable among the patriarchs of old, raising his eyes towards heaven, he prayed unto the Lord, and blessed me, with an attitude so resigned, so august, so holy, so full of real tenderness, that to the last day of my life the remembrance will remain graven on my heart in indelible characters.

When I retired, my eyes were swimming with tears; I was beside myself with grief; and yet I felt both encouraged and re-assured by the inexpressible calmness of my sovereign, and the sweet serenity of his features. It was indeed the greatness of a good man struggling against misfortune.

Four-and-twenty hours afterwards, Consalvi was obliged to leave Florence for Venice; the Pope was hurried through Alpine snows to Valence, in Dauphiné, where he died of his sufferings on the 29th of August, 1799.

And what a time for the election of a new Pope! Italy overrun by the French revolutionary armies, Rome in their possession, and ruled by a horde of incendiary demagogues; the Russians, headed by Suwarow, pouring into the Peninsula to oppose the French; whilst Austria, governed by a Thugut, was watching her opportunity to get hold of the new Pope—if there should be a Pope—and make him the pliant tool of her ambition. Nor let us forget that Bonaparte was on his way back from Egypt, preparing to swoop down, eagle-like, on those very Austrian possessions wherein the conclave was to meet. And yet the conclave *did* meet at Venice, on an island of that famous republic, which had so often defied the bans and interdicts of the Roman pontiffs;—the cardinals hurried from their neighbouring cities or secret abodes, though with views and intentions not perhaps exactly in accordance with the solemnity and urgency of the occasion. It is, indeed, a curious picture of human passions, though blended with higher motives and purposes,—that truthful memoir drawn up by Consalvi on the Conclave of 1800, wherein he was unanimously elected secretary to the assembly. The election lasted more than three long months, on account of the two contending factions, headed by Cardinal Herzan, on the part of Austria, and by the celebrated Maury, then bishop of Montefiascone in the Papal States. Consalvi, notwithstanding his wonted moderation, boldly proclaims these divisions to have been *scandalous* in such circumstances, and animadverts severely on the intrigues of the imperial court. And yet he cannot help observing that, on such occasions, the Sacred College seem led on, little by little, as it were by some higher power, to sacrifice their own private views and interests to the common weal of Christendom. So it was, indeed, in the

present juncture, thanks to the extraordinary ability, to the self-renouncement, prudence, and true Catholic spirit displayed throughout by the youthful secretary. The votes were gradually won over to Cardinal Chiaramonti, so well known afterwards by the name of Pius VII. Consalvi had truly displayed a master-mind; and the new Pontiff immediately showed how highly he appreciated his merit, by appointing him Secretary of State. We can easily believe the surprise and alarm of the new minister; for doubtless his was no easy task. The Austrians possessed nearly all the Papal States, whilst the King of Naples held Rome itself. The Court of Vienna, intent upon keeping at least the three Legations, which had recently been wrested from the French, offered at the same time to restore to the Pope the remaining parts of his dominions. To such a proposal the latter could but oppose a flat denial, accompanied by a firm resolution to return to Rome without delay. The imperial negotiator, Ghislieri, then reduced his demands to the two legations of Bologna and Ferrara; but he met with no better success. The spoliation of the Holy See, as the reader may now perceive, is after all an old story. The Pope, indeed, went so far as to write to the Emperor a letter, in which he formally demanded the restitution of all his provinces. No notice whatsoever was taken of the Papal missive. At last, utterly worn out by Austrian duplicity, Pius one day addressed Ghislieri in the following terms:—"Since the Emperor refuses obstinately a restitution, which both religion and equity require, I really do not see what new argument I can produce to convince him. Let his Majesty take care, however, not to lay by in his wardrobe any clothes belonging, not to himself, but to the Church. For not only will his Majesty be unable to wear them, but most probably they will pester with the grub his own hereditary dominions, which may be worm-eaten in a short time."

The Marquess Ghislieri hurried out of the Papal presence in a rage, which found vent when he met Consalvi. "The new Pope," he exclaimed, "has hardly donned his own clothes; he is not yet accustomed to his own craft, and he talks of the Austrian wardrobe being worm-eaten! He knows but little of our power: it would require thousands of moths to nibble it to dust." Two months after, the battle of Marengo had been fought and won: the Legations, Lombardy, Venetia, the hereditary German States, the capital itself, had fallen a prey to the Corsican conqueror! Pius VII. had scarcely set his foot on the shore of his own dominions when the news of the famous defeat arrived: "Ah!" exclaimed Ghislieri, a religious

man, after all, "I now see fulfilled the Pope's prediction : our wardrobe has truly been worm-eaten to tatters."

Pius VII. had but just returned to Rome, in the midst of a delighted and grateful population, when he received the astounding news that the conqueror of the Austrians was desirous of negotiating with the Holy See for the restoration of religion in France. Whilst at Vercelli, Bonaparte had met with Cardinal Martiniana, who was returning from the Conclave at Venice ; and he expressed himself so clearly, so pointedly, as to his future plans, that both Consalvi and the Pope were taken by surprise. Their approbation was immediately given, and the Pope himself wrote to Martiniana : "You may tell the First Consul that we will readily enter into a negotiation tending to an object so truly honourable, so congenial to our apostolical administration, and so thoroughly conformable to our own views."

The history of this celebrated treaty, on which so much hangs in France even in our own time, has been often related, and yet many a detail of the intricate negotiations which preceded its conclusion had remained secret until the publication of the present memoirs. Three personages stand out in strong relief on that occasion, each with his individual character :—Cacault, the French ambassador at Rome, Bonaparte, and Consalvi himself. Of the second, little need be said ; but M. Cacault is, we believe, hardly known in England. He was a Breton by birth, and, as such, had imbibed those religious feelings which stamp so strongly the most western province of France. As a Republican representative of the Directory, he did all in his power to avert from the Papal See those evils and that invasion which ended in the captivity of Pius VI. When Napoleon's star was in the ascendant, M. Cacault quickly discovered the depth and extent of his genius, and thenceforward abetted his plans. At the same time, he was by no means a flatterer, but ever plain-spoken to bluntness. A time came, indeed, when the greatest conqueror of modern times found the noble-hearted Breton rather too sincere, and consigned him to the peaceful life of a seat in his new-fangled Senate. But that day was yet to come. In 1801, M. Cacault enjoyed the whole confidence of the First Consul.

On leaving Bonaparte, the ambassador heard him utter those famous words, which have been so often quoted :—"Mind you treat the Pope as if he had 200,000 men at his back. Remember, also, that in October, 1796, I wrote to you how much I wished to save the Holy See, not to overthrow it, and that both you and I entertained the same feelings in this

respect." With credentials like these, M. Cacault should have found it an easy matter to negotiate with Rome; but, singular enough, the Conservative Government of Austria threw many an obstacle in the way. The very idea of a reconciliation between revolutionary France and the Papacy seems to have disquieted M. de Thugut, and he did all in his power to breed a feeling of distrust, on the part of Rome at least. The Court of Naples was animated by the same policy; and even Bonaparte himself, at one time, appeared to waver between the impulse of his own good sense, and the suggestions of his infidel advisers. In the eyes of M. Cacault, the Pope stood too much on theological tenets and opinions, when dealing with a victorious adventurer. At any rate, matters soon grew from bad to worse. In a fit of impatience, the Consul ordered his ambassador to leave Rome in five days, if the Concordat sent from Paris was not signed at the expiration of that short time.

At this critical juncture, the Breton came to a determination so truly characteristic of the man, that we must allow him to speak for himself. We borrow the following narrative from his secretary, M. Artaud:—

"We are bound to obey our Government," said he, addressing himself to me; "but then a government must be guided by a head capable of understanding negotiations, by ministers capable of advising him properly, and lastly, all must agree together. Every government ought to have a plan, a will, an aim of its own. But this is no easy matter with a new government. Now, though in a secondary station, I am really master of this business; but if we go on in Rome as they are going on in Paris, nothing can come out of it but a sort of chaos. . . . It is fully understood that the head of the State wished for a Concordat; he wished for it so far back as Tolentino, and even before, when he called himself *the best friend of the Pope*. . . . In fact, he has sent me here to negotiate a Concordat, and for that purpose has given me in yourself the prop I myself desired. But then his ministers probably don't wish for a Concordat, and they have constant access to his ear. Now the character most easy to irritate and to deceive, is that of a warrior, who as yet understands nothing about politics, and is ever returning to military orders and to the sword. . . . Shall we, like two fools, leave Rome in this way because the despatch orders us to do so, and give up France to *irreligiosity*—a word no less barbarous than the thing itself? Shall we leave her to a sort of spurious Catholicism, or that hybrid system which advises the establishment of a Patriarch? God knows, then, that the future destinies of the First Consul will probably never be fulfilled. . . .

"I am fond of Bonaparte, fond of the general; but this patch-work name of a First Consul is in itself ridiculous; he borrowed it from Rome, where he has never set his foot. But in my eyes he is still nothing more than an Italian general. As for the fate of this terrible general, it is now in my

hands more than in his own ; he is turning into a sort of Henry the Eighth, flattering and scaring the Holy See by turns ; but how many sources of true glory will be dried up for him, if he merely mimics Henry the Eighth ! The measure is full ; nations now-a-days will not allow their rulers to dispose of them in regard to religious matters. With Concordats, on the contrary, miracles may be wrought, more especially by him, or if not by him, supposing him to be unwise, by France herself. Be sure, my dear sir, that great deeds brought about at the proper moment, and bearing fruitful results, no matter by what genius they are accomplished, are a wealthy dowry for any country. In case of embarrassments, that country may ward off many an attack by pointing to its history. France, with all her faults, requires true grandeur. Our consul jeopardizes all by this pistol-shot fired in time of peace, merely for the sake of pleasing his generals whom he loves, but whose soldierlike jokes he fears, because he himself now and then gives way to them. He thus breaks off a negotiation which he wishes to succeed, and goes on casting rotten seed. What can really be a religious Concordat, that most solemn of all human undertakings, if it is to be signed in five days ? It reminds one of the twelve hours granted by a general to a besieged town, which can hope for no success."

The result of the above conversation on the part of M. Cacault, was a determination to quit Rome, but to leave his secretary in that city, whilst Consalvi himself was to set out immediately for Paris, as the only means of preventing a positiverupture between the two Courts, for Bonaparte had already both a court and courtiers. The French minister was by no means blind to the consequences of his boldness in undertaking to correct the false steps of his own government ; but, to his credit be it said, the fear of those consequences did not make him swerve one minute from his purpose. His very first step was, therefore, to request an interview with Consalvi, and an audience from the Pope. On meeting the Cardinal, he began by reading *in extenso* the angry despatch which he had received, not even omitting the epithets "*turbulent and guilty priest*," which the Consul applied to His Eminence. M. Cacault then resumed as follows :—

"There must be some misunderstanding ; the First Consul is unacquainted with your person, and still more with your talents, your ability, your precedents, your adroitness, and your anxiety to terminate this business. So you must start for Paris." "When ?" "To-morrow : you will please him ; you are fit to understand each other ; he will then learn to know a statesmanlike Cardinal, and you will draw up the Concordat together. But if you don't go to Paris I shall be obliged to break off all intercourse with you : and there are yonder certain ministers, who advised the Directory to transport Pius VI. to Guyana.

"I again repeat it, you must go to Paris, you will draw up the Concordat yourself—nay more, you will dictate a part of it, obtaining at the same time

far better conditions than I could ever do, fettered as I am by so many shackles. . . . One word more : In a place like this, where there is so much gossiping, I can't allow you to bear alone the responsibility of this action. I consider it as something truly grand, but as it may turn out a false step ; to-morrow I must see the Pope, and take the whole upon my own shoulders. I shall not bore the Pope, having but a few words to tell him, in order to fulfil the Consul's former instructions."

Consalvi, fired at the boldness of the plan, hurried to the Pope, rather to prepare him for this unforeseen separation than to ask for permission. When, on the other hand, the French diplomatist was admitted to his presence, he showed so much candour, such a true spirit of Christian feeling, such a total forgetfulness of self, that the Pontiff could not refrain from shedding tears, and ended by breaking out into these words : "Indeed, indeed, you are a true friend, and we love you as we loved our own mother. At this very moment, we will retire to our oratory, in order to implore God's blessing on this journey, as well as for the successful issue of an undertaking, which may afford us some consolation in the midst of so much affliction."

It was indeed a bereavement for the Pope, who, having hardly ascended the throne, was accustomed to consider Consalvi as his main prop and right hand in every affair of any importance. He, however, readily consented to the separation, and on the following day the Cardinal left Rome, accompanied by M. Cacault, in an open carriage, to show the gossiping Romans that no real coolness existed between the two Governments. This, in fact, strengthened the hands of the Papal administration, as reports were already rife that a French army was about to march once more into Rome, with a view of restoring the republic.

At the distance of more than half a century Consalvi's determination scarcely seems an act of daring ; but, at that period, it was considered in a different light. We must remember that France had been for ten long years the scene of anarchy and bloodshed within, while she had proved the terror of Europe on the field of battle. She was but just emerging from that anarchy, thanks to the iron grasp of a fortunate soldier, who might yet, for aught the world knew, turn out to be a bloody tyrant quite as well as a sagacious ruler. For a priest, and still more for a cardinal, to venture alone of his own accord into the lair of those beasts of prey, as they were then termed, certainly showed an extraordinary degree of moral courage, however M. Thiers may taunt Consalvi with his fears. Those fears the Papal minister *did* really entertain, as is proved by a few unwary lines which he addressed

before his departure to Acton at Naples, and which were betrayed to Bonaparte in Paris. But then the Cardinal, prompted by a strong feeling of duty, overcame those apprehensions, which is more perhaps than M. Thiers would vouch to have done on a similar occasion, if we may judge from the infidel spirit and intriguing disposition that are conspicuous alike throughout his own career and writings. Success, not principle, ever appears to be his leading star.

Once in Paris, Consalvi was not long in conquering that position, which the keenness of his friend Cacault foresaw that he was destined to assume. Bonaparte approved in every respect the conduct of his ambassador at Rome, appeared even flattered at being feared, at first received the Cardinal with affected coolness, but little by little yielded to better feelings, and ended by turning into ridicule "that fool Acton, who thought that he could stop the rush of a torrent with cobwebs." To these friendly dispositions soon succeeded on both sides a sincere confidence, and on one occasion the First Consul laughingly inquired of Consalvi whether he was not considered as a *priest eater* in Italy; and then suddenly launched into one of those splendid expositions of his future plans, by which he endeavoured to fascinate and charm those he aimed at winning over to his own views. In this sparkling conversation the Concordat held a foremost place. Napoleon developed, just as he pleased, opinions half Protestant, half Jansenist,—in other words, exactly what he wanted the Concordat to be, and exactly what Consalvi could not allow. The contest between those two rival spirits may well detain us a few moments longer. And why not say at once that by degrees the master-genius of the age was obliged to modify his own views, yielding, *nolens volens*, as he himself admitted, to the graceful bearing and sound good sense of the man whose countrymen had named him the Roman Syren?

We may gather from M. Thiers's work that Consalvi had undertaken a most arduous task. Paris itself must have offered a strange sight to a Roman cardinal in the very first year of the present century. The churches were still shut, and bore upon their porches such inscriptions as savoured more of heathenism than of Christianity. Wherever the legate's eye fell he was sure to meet with a Temple of Plenty, of Fraternity, of Liberty, of Trade, of Abundance, and so forth. And, then, when he went to court he found a ruler disposed to break out into the most violent fits of anger if his will was disputed, whilst on every hand he had to encounter a host of scoffers and infidels, belonging to every hue and grade. The army, the bench, the schools, the *sarants*, and the very clergy,

all vied in showing off Rome as the hotbed of an obsolete superstition which it was high time to do away with altogether. And when we mention the clergy, we mean the remains of that schismatic body which had hailed the civil constitution so formally condemned by the Holy See in 1791. They were active, intriguing, influential, and had the ear of Bonaparte himself. He was intent upon distributing among them a portion of the new sees about to be erected, and it required all the firmness of Consalvi to ward off this impending danger. If we may believe M. Thiers, many among them were by no means of dissolute lives; yet he cannot disguise the fact that they were ambitious, servile, and disposed to bend to every caprice of the ruling power. But that power was fully aware that the French population had no confidence whatever in their ministrations; the non-jurors, or priests who had unflinchingly remained faithful to their duty, were, on the contrary, sought out and held in high esteem. In this strange society the functions of Catholicism and the rites of our religion were openly resumed by believers, who attended them in back streets, in byways, in dark warehouses, whither some aged priest repaired at dawn, after escaping but shortly before from the dungeons of the Directory, or the scaffolds of the Revolutionary Committee. The writer of these lines has known more than one man who was baptized at that period in a miserable garret by some ecclesiastic disguised as a common labourer, before the eyes of his parents, though without any sponsors, for fear of detection. That such men should turn round in the streets of Paris and stare with wonder at the sight of a Cardinal publicly making for the Tuileries in one of the Consul's carriages is by no means surprising; but the fact increases our admiration for the two eminent statesmen who both cast such a firm glance into the depth of futurity.

Consalvi had only been a few hours in Paris when he was summoned before the First Consul, who sent him word that "he was to show off as much of a cardinal as possible." The able diplomatist was, however, not in the least disposed to "show off," and contented himself with wearing the indispensable insignia of his dignity. It will be well to remember that, at the time we are speaking of, no priest would have ventured to put on the clerical costume in the French capital. This first audience took place in public, in the midst of all the high functionaries of the State. On the Cardinal approaching, Bonaparte rose and said abruptly,—"I am aware of the object of your journey to France. My will is, that the conferences shall begin immediately. I give you five days for the

purpose, and tell you beforehand that, if on the fifth day the negotiations have not come to a conclusion, you may return to Rome; for, within my own mind, I have come to a determination should such an event take place."

"By sending his Prime Minister to Paris (replied coolly the Cardinal) His Holiness proves at any rate the interest he takes in the conclusion of a Concordat with the French Government, and I fully hope to terminate this business in the time you have marked." Apparently satisfied with this answer, Bonaparte immediately broke forth into one of those eloquent displays for which he was remarkable—the Concordat, the Holy See, the interests of religion, the articles which had been rejected by the Pope, all became, on his part, the subject of a most vehement and exhaustive speech, which was silently listened to by the surrounding audience.

One of the most amusing and almost ludicrous instances of the Consul's ignorance in regard to religious matters took place on this occasion. He bore a bitter hatred to the Jesuits, and was constantly harping on the subject. "I am quite astounded and scandalized (said he all of a sudden) that the Pope should be allied to a non-Catholic power like Russia, as is evident by the restoration of the Jesuits in that country. Such a union ought surely to wound and irritate a Catholic Sovereign, since it contributes to please a schismatical monarch."

"I must answer candidly (resumed the Cardinal) that your informations are incorrect on this matter. Doubtless the Pope has deemed it advisable not to refuse the request of the Russian Emperor for the restoration of the Jesuits in his own states, but, at the same time, his Holiness has shown no less fatherly affection and deference for the King of Spain, since an interval of several months has elapsed between Paul's request and the Bull, which was not sent before the Court of Spain had expressly stated that it would in no way complain of the act."

When Bonaparte had fixed such a short term for the conclusion of the Concordat, he fully intended that not a single jot of his own plan should be rejected by Rome. That plan, as we have already observed, was half schismatic, and would have bound over the French Church to the supreme will and power of the ruling Government. But Consalvi showed himself equally firm as to essentials, whilst he gracefully yielded to every demand of minor importance. As to the wisdom of this conduct, the present circumstances bear ample testimony; for, had the Cardinal been less firm, what might not be in 1865 the painful situation of the French Episcopacy? But the negotiations, instead of ending in five days, were

prolonged for more than three weeks, during which the Abbé Bernier, who represented his Government, was constantly starting new difficulties, and threatening Consalvi with some new outbreak of violence on the part of the First Consul.

At last, towards the middle of July, every difficulty being overcome, and Bonaparte having formally promised to accept every article of the Concordat as it had been agreed to at Rome, nothing remained but to copy and sign that famous treaty. The First Consul was to give a grand dinner on the 14th of July to foreigners of distinction, and to men of high standing in the country. His intention was to inform publicly his guests of this happy event, and on the 13th, the *Moniteur* published the following laconic piece of news:—"Cardinal Consalvi has succeeded in the object which brought him to Paris." Bonaparte had selected his brother Joseph, a Councillor of State, and Bernier to sign the deed, whilst on the other side were Consalvi, Monsignor Spina, and a theologian, named Father Caselli. But at the last moment there occurred one of the most astounding incidents contained in the history of diplomacy. As it has never been mentioned in any memoirs or documents of those times, we cannot do better than let the Cardinal relate it in his own words:—

Towards four o'clock in the afternoon, Bernier arrived with a roll of paper, which he did not unfold, but stated to be a copy of the Concordat that we were about to sign. We took our own with us; and set out all together for the house of citizen Joseph, as was the slang of the day, the brother to the First Consul. He received me with the utmost politeness. Though he had been ambassador at Rome, I had not been introduced to him, being yet but a prelate. During the few days I passed in Paris, I had not met him on a formal visit which I paid him, for he often resided in the country. This was, therefore, the first time we saw each other. After the usual compliments, he bade us to sit down round a table, adding: "We shall have soon done, having but to sign the compact, as all is concluded."

On being seated round the table, the question arose who should sign first. Joseph Bonaparte claimed the right as brother to the head of the Government. I observed with great mildness and firmness, that both as a cardinal and a legate of the Holy See, I could not consent to assume the second rank in signing; besides, under the old *régime* in France, as well as everywhere else, the cardinals enjoyed a right of precedence, which I could not give up, not indeed from any personal motive, but on account of the dignity with which I was invested. It is but due to Joseph to state, that after a momentary hesitation, he yielded with very good grace, and begged of me to sign first. He himself was to come after, followed by the prelate Spina, Councillor Cretet, Father Caselli, and the Abbé Bernier.

We set to work at once, and I had taken up the pen, when to my great

surprise, the Abbé Bernier presented to me his copy, with the view of making me sign it without examining its contents. On casting my eyes upon it in order to ascertain its identity with my own copy, I perceived that this ecclesiastical treaty was not the one agreed to by the respective Commissioners, not the one adopted by the First Consul himself, but another totally different! The difference existing at the very first outset, induced me to examine the whole with the most scrupulous attention, and I soon found out that this copy contained the draught which the Pope had refused to accept without his correction, the very refusal that had provoked an order to the French agent to leave Rome; nay more, that this self-same draught was modified in many respects by the insertion of certain clauses, previously declared to be inacceptable even before it had been sent to Rome.

A proceeding of this character, so truly incredible, and yet so real, which I shall not venture to qualify—for the fact speaks sufficiently for itself—a proceeding of this kind literally paralyzed my hand. I expressed my astonishment, declaring positively that on no condition could I give my approval to such a deed. The First Consul's brother did not appear less surprised than myself, pretending not to understand the matter. The First Consul, he added, had assured him that everything being agreed to, nothing remained but to sign. As for himself, he had just come up from the country, where he was busy with Count Cobenzel about the affairs of Austria, being called upon merely for the formality of signing the treaty. Concerning the matter itself, he absolutely knew nothing about it.

Cardinal Consalvi, even when writing the above lines, does not seem to doubt Joseph's sincerity, nor that of Councillor Cretet, who affirmed his own innocence in terms equally strong. The latter could hardly believe his own eyes, when the legate pointed out to him the glaring discrepancies between both copies. The Pope's minister then turning suddenly to Bernier: "Nobody better than yourself," said he, "can attest the truth of what I affirm; I am highly astonished at the studied silence which you maintain, and I must therefore call upon you positively to communicate to us what you must know so pertinently."

"Then, with an air of confusion and an embarrassed countenance, he faltered out that doubtless my language was but too true, and that he would not deny the difference of the documents now proposed for our signatures. 'But the First Consul has so ordained,' continued he, 'telling me that as long as no signature has been given, one is always at liberty to make any alteration. So he requires these alterations, because, after duly considering the whole matter, he is not satisfied with the previous stipulations.'"

The doctrine was so contrary to all precedents, that Consalvi had no difficulty in convincing his auditors of its futility. He moreover maintained his ground steadfastly, and

refused to make any further concession contrary to his duties. They cajoled him, they threatened him with the violence and "fury" of the omnipotent Consul; he remained unshaken. Joseph entreated him at least to go over the same ground once more, following the Papal copy, and to this the Cardinal consented, firmly resolved not to give up one single point of importance, but to modify such expressions as might induce Bonaparte to accept the original treaty. So these six men sat down again at five o'clock in the afternoon to discuss the whole question. The discussion was laborious, precise, searching, and heated on both sides. It lasted nineteen long hours, without interruption, without rest, without food, without even sending away the servants or the carriages, as will often happen when people hope to conclude at every minute some important business. On one article alone they could never agree, and it was specially reserved to the Pope's own decision. It was twelve o'clock the next day before they came to a conclusion. But would the First Consul adopt this plan? Would he not break all bounds, on finding his duplicity discovered, and himself balked by the Cardinal's firmness? Joseph hurried to the Tuileries, in order to lay the whole before his imperious brother, and in less than one hour came back, his features evidently showing the grief of his soul. Says Consalvi:—

He told us that the First Consul had broken forth into the greatest fury on being apprized of what had taken place. In his fit of anger he had torn to pieces the Concordat we had drawn up among us; but at last, yielding to Joseph's entreaties and arguments, he had promised, though with the most extreme repugnance, to accept every article we had agreed to, except the one we had reserved, and about which he was no less inflexible than irritated. The First Consul, added Joseph, had closed the interview by telling him to inform me that he (Bonaparte) was decided upon maintaining this article as it was expressed in Bernier's copy:—consequently, I had but two ways before me: either to adopt this article just as it was in the Concordat, or to give up the negotiations. As for him, he had made up his mind to announce either the signature or the rupture of the affair at the grand dinner he was to give on that day.

The reader will easily imagine our consternation at this message. We had yet three hours until five o'clock, the time appointed for the dinner, at which we were all to attend. I really am unable to repeat all the Consul's brother and the two other Commissioners said, to conquer my resistance. The picture of the consequences likely to ensue upon the rupture was indeed of the darkest colour; they gave me to understand that I alone should become responsible for those evils in the face of France and Europe, as well as to my own sovereign and Rome. I should be accused of an unseasonable stiffness, and of having brought on the results of such a refusal. I felt a

death-like anguish, on conjuring up before my eyes the realization of these prophecies, and I was—if I may be allowed such words—like unto the man of sorrow. But my duty won the victory: thanks to heaven, I did not betray it. I persisted in my refusal during the two hours of this contest, and the negotiation was broken off.

Such was the ending of this sad debate, which had lasted four-and-twenty hours, having begun at four o'clock on the preceding day, and closed towards the same hour of this unfortunate one. Our bodily sufferings were doubtless very great, but they were nothing when compared to our moral anxiety, which rose to such a pitch that one must really have undergone such tortures to form an idea of them.

I was condemned—and this was indeed a most cruel circumstance at such a moment—to appear in an hour after at the famous banquet. I was bound to front in public the very first shock of that headstrong anger which the General Bonaparte would feel on being apprized by his brother of the rupture.

We hastened back to our hotel, in order to make a few rapid preparations, and then hurried all three to the Tuileries. We had hardly entered the saloon where the First Consul was standing—a saloon filled with a crowd of magistrates, officers, state grandees, ministers, ambassadors, and illustrious foreigners, who had been invited to the dinner—when we were greeted in a way which may easily be imagined, as he had already seen his brother. As soon as he perceived me, he exclaimed, his face flushed with anger, and in a loud and indignant tone:—

“Well, Monsieur le Cardinal, you have had your fling; you have broken off: be it so! I don't stand in need of Rome. I will act for myself. I don't stand in need of the Pope. If Henry the Eighth, who had not one-twentieth part of my power, was enabled to change the religion of his country, and to succeed in his plans, far better shall I know how to do it, and to will it. By changing the religion in France, I shall change it throughout the best part of Europe,—everywhere, in fact, where my power is felt. Rome will soon perceive her own faults; she will rue them, but it will then be too late. You may take your leave; it is the best thing you can do. You have willed a rupture: be it so! When do you intend setting out?”

“After dinner, general,” replied I, with the greatest calmness.

These few words acted as an electric shock on the First Consul. He stared at me for a few minutes; and, taking advantage of his surprise, I replied to his vehement outbreak, that I neither could nor would go beyond my instructions on matters which were positively opposed to the maxims of the Holy See.

Here the Consul interrupted Consalvi, though in a milder tone, to tell him that he insisted upon having the Concordat signed according to his own views, or not at all. “Well then,” retorted the Cardinal, “in that form I neither shall nor will ever subscribe to it, no—never.” “And that is the very reason,” cried out Bonaparte, “why I tell you that you are

bent upon breaking off, and why Rome will shed tears of blood on this rupture."

What a scene! and how finely the bold, calm demeanour of the Pope's legate shows in strong relief against that dark, passionate, and ominous, though intelligent face of Napoleon Bonaparte! What a splendid subject for a painter, and how it calls up at once to our mind those barbaric chieftains of old, fit enough to wield the sword, fit enough even to lay the snares of a savage, but unable to cope with the spiritual strength of a Christian bishop, and utterly cowed by the meek sedateness of some missionary monk, just wafted over from the shores of Ireland! Write the seventh, or the thirteenth, instead of the nineteenth century, and say if the incident would be clothed in different colours; for, in fact, what was Bonaparte himself but the Hohenstaufen of his age—a strange mixture of real grandeur, of seething passions, and of mean, crafty, fox-like cunning?

The French editor of these Memoirs very justly observes that some vestige of the above scene must still exist in the documents of the Imperial Archives, and expresses the wish that the charge of duplicity so terribly brought home to the first Bonaparte, may be properly sifted and repelled. Of the existence of such information we have scarcely any doubt, but we hardly believe that the select Committee, headed by Prince Napoleon, who have already so unscrupulously tampered with the correspondence of the great founder of the present dynasty, will ever rebut the accusation, or even take notice of the narrative. And yet it bears the stamp of truth in every line, so prone was Napoleon to those fits of anger, which he sometimes used, Thiers himself admits it, as tools for his policy, and to serve his end.

After all, the First Consul was glad to escape from the consequences of his own violence, since, on the personal interference of the Austrian Ambassador, he again consented that the conferences should be renewed. The two cardinal points on which, in the eyes of Rome, the whole fabric of the Concordat rested, were the freedom and publicity of the Catholic worship. Without these two essential conditions, the Pope and his ministers deemed that the Church obtained no compensation for the numerous sacrifices which she consented to undergo in other respects. The French Government, on the contrary, admitted that freedom and publicity, only so far as they were allowed to other forms of worship, and saddled the article with the following rider:—"The public worship shall be free, as long as it conforms to the police regulations." Such was the final difficulty against which Consalvi maintained a most obsti-

nate opposition, and it must be admitted that his grounds were of a very serious nature. Taught by the experience of other times and countries, he considered the obnoxious condition as a bold attempt to enslave the Church by subjecting her to the secular power. On the flimsy pretext of acting as the protector and defender of the Church, a government was enabled to lord it over her, and cripple her best endeavours for the fulfilment of her divine mission. If such had been the case, even under the old French monarchy, notwithstanding the strong Catholic dispositions of the Bourbon sovereigns in general, as well as in the times of a Joseph II. and a Leopold of Tuscany, what greater changes were to be feared on the part of the revolutionary powers, which now swayed over France? The Cardinal readily admitted that, in the present state of the country, it might be proper for the Government to restrict on certain occasions the publicity of the Catholic worship, for the very sake of protecting its followers against the outbreaks of popular frenzy; but why lay down such a sweeping and such an elastic rule? "With a clause of this kind," said the Legate, "the police, or rather the Government, will be enabled to lay their hands on everything, and may subject all to their own will and discretion, whilst the Church, constantly fettered by the words, 'As long as it conforms,' will have no right even to complain." To these arguments the Consul constantly replied, "Well, if the Pope can't accept such an indefinite and mild restriction, let him omit the article, and give up publicity of worship altogether." As a curious specimen of sincerity and candour, we must observe that Consalvi was not even allowed to consult with his own Court, nor to send a courier, the French Government refusing to supply him with the necessary passports. So much for the international privileges of ambassadors. Who can be astonished that the Papal minister should feel but little confidence in the good faith of those he had to deal with?

Their attitude, indeed, seems to have strengthened his own unbending firmness. In the course of these everlasting debates, he clenched the subject in the following terms:—"Either you are sincere in maintaining that the Government is obliged to impose a restriction upon the publicity of the religious worship, being impelled thereunto by the necessity of upholding the public peace and order, and in that case the Government cannot and ought not to hesitate as to asserting the fact in the article itself; or the Government does not wish it to be so expressed; and in that case, they show their bad faith, as also that the only object of the aforesaid restriction is the enslavement of the Church to their own will."

The Commissioners found nothing to reply to this dilemma; for, in fact, Consalvi only asked that the reserve itself should be laid down as a temporary restriction. At last they yielded, despairing of ever overcoming, on this subject, their unflinching and powerful antagonist. The Concordat duly signed and authenticated, was sent up for approval to the First Consul, who, after another fit of anger, gave his consent; but, as Consalvi himself presumes, from that hour he resolved to annul the intrinsic and most beneficial effects of the Concordat by those celebrated organic articles which are even at this moment a bone of contention between the French clergy and the Imperial Government.

It is, indeed, a most remarkable fact that the same man who imperiously prescribed that the Concordat should be drawn up and signed in the course of five days, allowed a full year to elapse before he published it and sent the official ratifications to Rome. When he did fulfil these formalities, he coupled them with the promulgation of those famous laws which, in reality, tended to cut off all free communication between the Holy See and the Gallican clergy, and to spread throughout Europe the false belief that the Pope himself had concurred in the adoption of these obnoxious measures. In vain did Pius VII. protest against them—in vain, at a later period, was he induced to crown the Emperor in Paris, in hopes of obtaining the fulfilment of his own promises. Napoleon turned a deaf ear to the most touching importunities. On considering the whole of his conduct, it is hardly possible to refrain from concluding that Bonaparte ever looked upon the Pope's supremacy and power as an appendage and satellite of his own paramount omnipotence. Viewed by this light, many of his acts in latter years will appear at least consistent, though by no means justifiable on any principle whatsoever. Is there not often a certain consistency in madness? And if so in ordinary life, why not in the freaks and starts of despotism? And again, is not despotism itself madness in disguise?

But why indulge in our own speculations and surmises, when we have before us positive evidence that in 1801, as well as ten years afterwards, Napoleon entertained and maintained a plan for arrogating to himself both the spiritual and temporal power? The example set by Henry VIII., Albert of Brandenburg, and Peter I. of Russia, were ever before his eyes, blinding his own innate good sense, and exerting a sort of ominous fascination over his best impulses. The reader has doubtless heard of, if not perused, those wonderful pages in which the fallen giant whiled away his tedious hours at St.

Helena, pretending to write his own history, but in reality veiling truth under fiction, and endeavouring to palm upon the world certain far-fetched views of benevolence or civilization, which he never dreamt of whilst he was on the throne. Still, that strange *Memorial of St. Helena* often contains many a startling proof of candour, as if the mask suddenly fell, and revealed to our astonished gaze the inner man. Among such passages, none perhaps are so remarkable as those referring to the Concordat and to the religious difficulties of later years. One day Napoleon dictated to General Montholon these lines, which so strongly justify Consalvi's fears and opposition:—

“When I seized the helm, I already held most precise and definite ideas on all those principles which cement together the social body. I fully weighed the importance of religion—on that head I was convinced—and had resolved to restore it. But one can hardly realize the difficulties I had to contend with when about to bring back Catholicism. I should have been readily supported had I unfurled the Protestant standard. This feeling went so far that, in the Council of State, where I met with the strongest opposition against the Concordat, many a man tacitly determined to plot its destruction. ‘Well,’ used they to say, ‘let us turn Protestants at once, and then we may wash our hands of the business.’ It is, indeed, quite true that, in the midst of so much confusion and so many errors, I was at liberty to choose between Catholicism and Protestantism; and still truer that everything favoured the latter. But, *besides* my own personal bias inclining towards my national religion, I had most weighty reasons to decide otherwise. I should thus have created in France two great parties of equal strength, though I was determined to do away with every party whatsoever; I should have conjured up all the frenzy of religious warfare, whilst the enlightenment of the age and my own will aimed at crushing it altogether. By their mutual strife these two parties would have torn France asunder, and made her a slave to Europe, whilst my ambition was to make her its mistress. Through Catholicism I was far surer of attaining all my great objects. At home, the majority absorbed the minority, which I was disposed to treat with so much equity that any difference between both would soon disappear; abroad, Catholicism kept me on good terms with the Pope. Besides, thanks to my own influence and to our forces in Italy, I did not despair, sooner or later, by some means or other, to obtain the direction and guidance of the Pope; and then what a new source of influence! what a lever to act upon public opinion, and to govern the world!”

A few moments after the Emperor resumed:—

“Francis I. had a capital opportunity to embrace Protestantism, and to become its acknowledged head throughout Europe. His rival, Charles V., resolutely sided with Rome, because he considered this the best way to subject Europe. This alone should have induced Francis to defend European independence. Instead of that, he left a reality to run after a shadow, following

up his pitiful quarrels in Italy, allying himself with the Pope, and burning the Reformers in Paris.

"Had Francis I. embraced Lutheranism, which is so favourable to the royal supremacy, he would have spared France those dreadful convulsions which were afterwards brought on by the Calvinists, whose republican organization was so near ruining both the throne and our fine monarchy. Unfortunately, Francis was unable to understand anything of the kind. As to his scruples, they are quite out of the question, since this self-same man made an alliance with the Turks, whom he introduced among us. O, those stupid times! O, that feudal intellect! After all, Francis I. was but a tilting king, a drawing-room dandy—a would-be giant, but a real pigmy."

It is scarce necessary to add, that at the time Napoleon is speaking of he was an unbeliever, though a lurking respect for his national religion still lingered at the bottom of his heart. But then, how fully does he admit that religion was but a tool of his ambition! How openly does he confess his plan to get hold of the Pope *by some means or other!* How glaringly true must now appear in our eyes that narrative of Consalvi's, in which he exposes the mean trick that Napoleon endeavoured to play upon his vigilance! Lastly, how faithfully does the Emperor adhere to the plans secretly laid within the dark mind of the First Consul! For, as if to leave no doubt as to the fulfilment of those plans, he related to Montholon the most minute details of what took place during the Pope's captivity at Fontainebleau:—

"The English," said Napoleon, "plotted an escape for him from Savona; the very thing I could have wished for. I had him brought to Fontainebleau, where his misfortunes were to end, and his splendour to be restored. All my grand views had been thus fulfilled under disguise and in secrecy. I had so managed that success was infallible, even without an effort. Indeed, the Pope adopted the famous Concordat of Fontainebleau, notwithstanding my reverses in Russia. But how far different had I returned triumphant and victorious! So at last I had obtained the long-wished-for separation of the spiritual and temporal powers; whilst their confusion is so fatal to the former, by causing trouble and disorder within society in the name of Him who ought to become a centre of union and harmony. Henceforward I intended to place the Pope on a pinnacle; we would not even have regretted his temporal power, for I would have made an idol of him, and he would have dwelt close to me. Paris should have become the capital of the Christian world, and *I would have governed the spiritual as well as the political world.* By this means I should have been enabled to strengthen the federative portions of the empire, and to maintain peace in such parts as were beyond its limits. I should have had my religious sessions just the same as my legislative sessions; my councils would have represented all Christendom, and the Popes would have merely acted as their presidents. I should myself have opened their assemblies, approved and promulgated their decrees, as

was the case under Constantine and Charlemagne. In fact, if the emperors lost this kind of supremacy, it was because they allowed the spiritual ruler to reside at a distance from them ; and those rulers took advantage of this act of weakness, or this result of the times, to escape from the prince's government, and even to overrule it."

What words of ours could add to the bold significance of these ? How the proud spirit of the despot towers even within his prison ! and how little had he profited by the bitter lessons of experience ! Never before, do we believe, since the advent of Christianity, did any king or conqueror profess such a barefaced contempt for the deepest feelings of a Christian soul—the freedom of his spiritual being ! This pretended liberation from the Court of Rome, this religious government concentrated within the hands of the sovereign, became indeed, at one time, the constant object of Napoleon's thoughts and meditations :—

"England, Russia, Sweden, a large part of Germany (was he wont to say) are in possession of it ; Venice and Naples enjoyed it in former times. Indeed, there is no doing without it, for otherwise a nation is ever and anon wounded in its peace, in its dignity, in its independence. But then such an undertaking is most arduous ; at every attempt I was beset with new dangers ; and, once thoroughly embarked in it, the nation would have abandoned me. More than once I tried to awaken public opinion ; but all was in vain, and I was obliged to acknowledge that the people would not follow me."

On reading these last words, who will not remember Caccault's apophthegm, uttered in 1801—"Nations now-a-days will not allow their rulers to dispose of them in regard to religious matters."

We hope that the reader will not accuse us of prolixity for having related rather fully the negotiations which preceded the Concordat of 1801. Hitherto the main facts of this important event had been gleaned from French sources of information. No voice had been raised, we believe, on the part of Rome, and no one, it must be admitted, had a better right to speak of that celebrated treaty than the man who contributed so largely, so exclusively, we might almost say, to its final adoption. And then, throughout the whole of his simple and unpretending, yet clear and spirited memoirs, the great Cardinal reads us a grand lesson, which may be felt and understood by every human soul. During the perusal of these two volumes, we have ever before our eyes the struggle of right against might, of duty against tyranny, of a true Christian soul against the truckling, shuffling, intriguing spirit of the world. Ever and anon, this able, firm, and yet amiable diplomatist, allows some expression to escape him, which shows

that his heart and soul are elsewhere, that his beacon is on high, and that he views everything and all things in this nether world from the light of the Gospel. And this, perhaps, is the very reason why, throughout a long career of such numerous difficulties and dangers, he moved serene, undaunted, unblemished in his honour, proclaimed wisest amongst the wise, until kings, princes, warriors, and statesmen, Protestants and Catholics, counted his friendship and esteem of priceless value.

ART. VI.—WANTED A POLICY FOR IRELAND.

The Irish Question, considered in a series of Letters addressed to the Editor of the *Tablet*. By R. D. O. (Printed for private circulation.) London : Keating & Co., 1865.

"IRELAND is like a corpse on the dissecting table," was the expression in which an Irish exile of 1855 condensed his despair when abandoning his seat in Parliament and the career to which he had devoted the best years of his life, he embarked for Australia. Ten years have since elapsed, and, as we review them, it seems to us as if all that has been since said and done concerning Irish public affairs, amounted to no more than a series of studies of morbid anatomy. Even the late debate in Parliament, highly interesting and able as it was, tended to no living end. It was in the nature of a very learned and patient discussion of certain very profound questions of political pathology. Every speaker, at least every speaker who spoke from an Imperial point of view, seemed to treat the decomposition of an ancient Christian nation (which is the process actually going on) as if it were inevitable, and, apart from present malarious accidents, on the whole beneficial. When the Government were asked could they do nothing to arrest an emigration that, as Lord Robert Cecil aptly phrased it, is going on "at the rate of an army a year," Lord Palmerston and Sir Robert Peel declared that it was impossible to prevent men going from a state of poverty, and misery, and turbulence at home, to a condition of peace, prosperity, and contentment abroad.

To what happy land, then, do these 100,000 Irishmen a year direct their grateful steps? For what more fortunate zone do they leave their own fertile soil and genial clime, the comforts and associations of home and religion, the liberties and blessings of British government, and the ægis of the Queen's flag? For the United States of America, a country (accord-

ing, not to our opinion, but to that of the organs who advise them to go, when there is question of anything except Irish emigration) plunged in the last agonies of civil war, on the verge of national bankruptcy, where every man that lands is liable to conscription, and led to almost certain slaughter under ruthless or incompetent generals—where democracy, in fine, has extemporized a worse despotism than that of the Czar. “It is the duty of every Irishman,” according to the new political economy, “to go to America in order to make room for a bullock.” Whether the Irishman who goes is shot down with hundreds of his countrymen in some bloody *battue*, like that which covered whole acres of ground in front of Mary’s Heights with the bodies of Irish peasants—whether the Irishwoman who goes is only another wretched unit added to the thousands of her countrywomen who stock the streets of the American cities, is immaterial. Let them go. The autopsy is yet incomplete. In the course of time Ireland will be reduced to the condition of a piscicultural establishment, only fit for spawning colonies with human mammals, and its government will be a problem presenting no more difficulty than that of the Isle of Man, instead of being the one great domestic danger and disgrace of the empire, as it was in the years preceding the Potato Famine.

The unreality, the unveracity of such a debate as this is simply shocking. Parliament applies its mind for two consecutive nights to the question whether an expenditure of some hundreds of thousands of pounds on draining the basin of the Shannon will really abate all the ills of Ireland, and has no difficulty in deciding that question in the negative. Then the character of the debate is commented upon by Parliament itself and by the press. How moderate, how temperate, how practical,—none of the old violence of faction, none of the old lamentable tendency to personality! It is evidently considered that Parliament has done a great deal when it listens to everybody that is willing to speak on such a subject, rejects every proposal that may be brought forward from whatever side of the House, and politely declines to consider the question of the condition of Ireland as having any bearing whatever upon the policy of the State.

But at the bottom of all this, it is obvious enough, that there is a silent settled determination upon the part of Parliament to govern Ireland against the grain, and to ignore the necessity of its having any special policy with regard to that country—to leave it to the flux and reflux of seasons and events, and allow natural causes to work their best or their worst, with-

out any impulse or direction from the public authority. This may be very good political economy according to that school of political economy which Mr. Carlyle calls "the Dismal Science," but it is very shallow statecraft. Mr. Bright has more than once said, and very truly said, that every Irishman who goes to America, goes as the enemy of England. If there is to be—which God forbid! but which all the world apprehends—a war between this country and the United States, it will be in a very great degree due to the Irish journalists, who almost exclusively conduct the New York Press; to the Irish Vote which is in the present shifty state of American parties the weightiest and perhaps the best organized element in the American electoral system; and to the immense army of Irishmen in the service of the States, who will be as eager to follow Sherman and Sheridan across the British frontier, as Jackson and Montgomery found their countrymen in the wars of the Revolution and of 1814. England will, in such a war, find herself really fighting an Irish rebellion under the flag of the United States, as Austria was pitted at Magenta and Solferino not so much against the French eagles, as against the Italian conspirators, who had shot the Emperor Napoleon into a belief in the "freedom of Italy." Whether it will then be considered good political economy to have encouraged Irish emigration remains to be seen. The state, which so deliberately prefers cattle to men for subjects, will doubtless be able to make sheep and oxen equal to the militia, or at least the volunteers, in the field of battle.

But candid and honest Englishmen constantly ask, What does Ireland really want? Ireland wants, on the part of British statesmen, a policy; and still more, on the part of the British Parliament, good-will to assist and give efficacy to that policy. But "what one nation hates most," said Napoleon, "is another nation." The British Parliament, a concentrated essence of all the passions and prejudices, as well as of all the abilities and virtues of the English nation, in dealing with the affairs of Ireland, neither considers them as if Ireland were really and truly a part of the United Kingdom, nor yet as if Ireland were a peculiar province requiring special and exceptional consideration. The animus of Parliament (of the majority of Parliament, taking both Houses together, we mean, of course), in considering the affairs of Ireland, is even still, three generations after the Union, that of one nation dealing with another nation—dealing with it not perhaps exactly as an enemy, but as an obstacle, a nuisance, a reproach, a cause of continual incomprehensible annoyance, and occasional serious danger, an opposite "moral essence"

from itself, with different instincts and habits, which it is impossible to gratify, and not even easy to apprehend. It was said during the late debate that if Ireland could only be towed round from the west to the east of England, and placed close to the coast of France, Parliament would soon see the necessity of settling certain Irish questions which it now contemptuously shelves from session to session. If Ireland, on the other hand, could only be towed half way across the Atlantic, she would be sure of still greater consideration, for she would then be regarded as a colony occupying one of the most important positions on the globe, and would have the best constitution the Colonial Office could give her. Such hypothetical considerations as these, the force of which is simply obvious, are the worst reproach of the actual system of the British Parliament. That system allows the Irish nation to feel that Parliament will only act, where Irish interests are concerned, under the influence of alarm; and it is no exaggeration to say that this is a universal feeling throughout Ireland. It is not without reason. Take the few leading events in the recent Parliamentary history of Ireland. Parliament was induced to pass Catholic Emancipation only because the Duke of Wellington said there was no other alternative to civil war. When Sir Robert Peel wanted to increase the Maynooth grant by a few thousand pounds, his principal plea to the House of Commons was that there was "a cloud in the West," a danger of war with America in consequence of the Oregon question. Thus every act of justice that is done to Ireland is done, not as it ought to be done for justice' sake and on the merits, but as a concession and an act of propitiation to the natural ally of the enemy. We fear we are approaching a period of such ignominious arguments again.

Parliament is herein, if it be possible to divide such a responsibility, far more to blame than Ministers. If the Irish representatives could only deal directly with the really responsible statesmen of either side of the House, and the arrangements which the Minister believed in his conscience to be just could be there and then carried out by a sort of organic constitutional convention, there would be little difficulty in settling the conditions of an Irish policy. Ireland is a Catholic country with a Protestant Church Establishment and an endowed Presbyterian clergy, while the very existence of the Church of the great majority of the people is expressly negatived by Act of Parliament, and every act of its administration, except the rite of marriage, is either void or penal in point of law. No one can hold that these ecclesiastical arrangements are such as could endure for a single year, if

Ireland had the power of self-government, or was governed by England on the same principles that are applied to the Colonies, or to India or Malta. According to the system which holds everywhere else throughout the Empire, the Catholic Church, if not the endowed and established Church, should receive the same attributions and consideration from the State, as the two other Churches, one of which is established and the other endowed. Every English statesman of eminence since Mr. Pitt has declared his opinion that the ecclesiastical arrangements of Ireland are, on the whole, anomalous and inequitable. But no British statesman will consider that he is bound to stake the fate of a Ministry on the question of their rectification, unless he can tell Parliament at the same time that there is danger of a rebellion or a foreign war. The majority of Parliament would, in ordinary times, only see in any such proposed measure an attack upon the Protestant religion as by law established, a precedent for injury to the Church of England, and another fatal concession to Rome.

So with the question of the tenure of land in Ireland. Every one knows that the whole social system of Ireland is totally different from that of England—that the relation of landlord and tenant is in a variety of ways dissimilar, that the proportions of the population employed in agriculture and in manufactures are not the same; that the people have in their nature that absorbing love of land which belongs to Celtic races; that they have no great natural aptitude to manufactures, and that the soil contains in no considerable proportion the great constituents of modern manufactures, coal and iron. Parliamentary commissions and committees, the greatest authorities on political economy, judges on the bench, the officials who have had most experience of Irish administration, have again and again advised special legislation in conformity with the genius of the people and the circumstances of the case. But Parliament always refuses: and this is a point upon which Ministers are afraid of Parliament. Some respectable English country member, like Sir John Walsh, issues on such an occasion to carry with him a majority of the House of Commons, who believe that any exceptional treatment of the Irish tenant is calculated to establish a precedent dangerous to the rights of property in Great Britain. There is a cry of communism and confiscation raised against measures such as Lord Devon, the Master of the Rolls, and Mr. J. Stuart Mill have recommended by Parliamentary Commission, by judgment in Court, and by arguments which public opinion absolutely accepts. If it were only a question between Indian ryots and talookdars, Parliament would have exceedingly small scruples as to the rights of

property. But there is only a channel between England and Ireland: there is an ocean between England and India. No Indian talookdar sits or has influence in either House of Parliament; but many English Peers and Commoners are large absentee landed proprietors in Ireland; and the Irish landlords, from their very excessive powers, which it is of the very essence of the question to rectify, have managed to monopolize a very considerable proportion of the Irish representation. In these ways, it cannot be denied, Ireland has hitherto been reaping all the disadvantages of the Union. The rule of Parliament appears to be that what may be clearly and manifestly good for Ireland shall not be done for fear it should be drawn into a precedent for Great Britain, where, owing to different circumstances, it would be manifestly or presumably bad.

But it is not merely by this conspiracy of obstruction that Parliament interferes with the good government of Ireland. Parliament will insist on governing Ireland against the grain, even where Ireland demands no exceptional legislation, but simply an assimilation of its law to that of Great Britain. The Irish people, Protestant as well as Catholic, are beyond any manner of doubt earnestly partial to a system of national education in which religion shall form an integral part of primary instruction. The English people are, so far as there is any evidence on the point, comparatively indifferent to such a combination. Whether they would quite like a system of mixed education, if it was forced upon them by law may, perhaps, be doubted; the Irish certainly do not. Nevertheless it is the law in England that no Government grant shall be given to any school not specially connected with a recognized religious denomination, and under its direct spiritual supervision, and it is the law in Ireland that the children of all religious denominations shall perforce be educated in common, and that the element of religion shall be utterly eliminated from the subjects taught in school. The prejudice of the system, indeed, touches not merely the element of religion, but even the patriotic sentiment. No one would dream of excluding Scott's or Burns's ballads from a Scotch school, but anything in prose or poetry relating to the history of Ireland is carefully excised from the schoolbooks of the National Board. In this case of national education, Parliament is only asked to assimilate the law of the two countries—not by any means to exercise an exceptional policy towards Ireland. But there is almost as much difficulty of reaching its conscience in this matter of obvious justice and mere fair play as if it were question of disendowing the Church of Ireland, or enacting the custom of the Ulster tenant right in express clauses.

The question of the taxation of Ireland is another of those leading questions which has lately embarrassed Parliament. Here, again, the economists make a most specious case against Irish claimants. The individual Irishman is not taxed more, not so much indeed, as the individual Englishman. Notably he has no assessed taxes to pay. If the proportion of two-seventeenths settled by the Act of Union has been disturbed, if the exchequers of the two countries were at a certain period consolidated, it was and is all for the express advantage of Ireland, which became unable to pay its own way in proportion to the general expenditure of the empire during the great war with France. But had Ireland, as a separate kingdom attached to the crown of Great Britain by the same link that also at that time united Hanover, any special and separate interest in a war with France? Certainly the kingdoms were united, but they had been united expressly with a view to such a contingency, by means which no historian ventures to defend, and which in the opinion of the most eminent lawyers rendered the Act null. Certainly the kingdoms were united, and Ireland was accordingly saddled with a share, in proportion to her population, of all the liabilities which the Imperial Parliament chose to incur in order to destroy the French Empire. When the Irish Parliament resigned its functions the revenue of Ireland was prosperous, and her debt only amounted to twenty-seven millions sterling. When the exchequers were consolidated, eighteen years afterwards, the separate debt of Ireland exceeded 130 millions. The Irish Parliament would never have dared to incur such a debt. Such an enormous liability having been imposed upon Ireland strictly in consequence of the Union, and for no considerable advantage to her, it might at least be expected that she would receive some countervailing advantages. But where are they? The engagements which the minister made with the Catholics were unhesitatingly violated. Absenteeism continued to increase, and with it the impoverishment and local mal-administration of the country. It becomes rather more than less difficult to pass any measure intended for the benefit of Ireland, through the Imperial than through the Irish Parliament. But it is idle to discuss this now. When, however, we are told that so far from Ireland being taxed unjustly, she escapes the assessed taxes altogether, we are tempted to ask English critics, do they altogether forget that the ecclesiastical grievances of Ireland are not merely offensive to feeling, but are an actual financial oppression? As R. D. O. says, "It requires a great amount of the virtue of self-reliance, which is so constantly preached to Irishmen, to enable them to bear two

Church Establishments instead of one"—and there is at all events this difference between the Irish Catholic, who owns such property as would subject him to the assessed taxes in England or Scotland, and any other tax-payer in the empire: (1) That the whole or a part of the maintenance of the Protestant parson of the parish is a first charge on his lands; (2) that he has besides to pay his proportion as a general tax-payer, of the *Regium Donum* to the Presbyterian clergyman; and (3) that out of duty to his own Church, he must besides contribute liberally to the maintenance of the Catholic priesthood and to the support of the fabric and institutions of the Church.

The simple fact is, that the case of Ireland demands energetic, comprehensive, and conscientious statesmanship. Nothing that we can say on the subject of its actual political state can be so complete and so impressive as Mr. Disraeli's picture of Ireland in 1844, which was a true picture then, and is a true picture unfortunately still, excepting the density of population, which has been cured by the famine:—

That dense population in extreme distress inhabited an island where there was an Established Church which was not their Church, and a territorial aristocracy, the richest of whom lived in distant capitals. Thus they had a starving population and an alien Church, and, in addition, the weakest executive in the world. That was the Irish question. Well, then, what would honourable gentlemen say if they were reading of a country in that position? They would say at once—the remedy is revolution. But the Irish could not have a revolution; and why? Because Ireland was connected with another and more powerful country. Then what was the consequence? The connection with England thus became the cause of the present state of Ireland. If the connection with England prevented a revolution, and a revolution were the only remedy, England logically was in the odious position of being the cause of all the misery of Ireland. What, then, was the duty of an English minister? To effect by his policy all those changes which a revolution would do by force. That was the Irish question in its integrity. The moment they had a strong executive, a just administration, and ecclesiastical equality, they would have order in Ireland, and the improvement of the physical condition of the people would follow.

What, then, is the duty of an English Minister—of one of the ministers of a period rapidly approaching—of such a minister as Mr. Disraeli himself, or Mr. Gladstone? "To effect by his policy all those changes which a revolution would effect by force?" Ireland would be well content with far less than that. But it does at least behove the English Minister to have a policy, and avow it, and to be prepared to stake office on its acceptance by Parliament; and a great Minister, who cared more for right and justice than for the passions of

parties, would inevitably succeed in such a policy to his own enduring honour.

As it is, what can be more obvious than the utter absence of anything that deserves the name of policy in the management of Ireland? "The weakest executive in the world!" Is that less true in 1865 than it was in 1844? In what other country on the face of the globe could such a series of scenes of brutal violence, and unbridled mob-law take place, as for many days together defaced the populous town of Belfast with blood and wreck last autumn? The Hospital Report reads like the return of a battle:—"98 gunshot wounds; killed, 11; injuries of all kinds, 316; recovered (on the 6th of November, three months after the riots), 219."* During these riots, the executive was weak in the worst possible sense of the word. It was absent. The Lord Lieutenant was ill. The Chancellor was travelling. The Chief Secretary was visiting his estates in England. The conduct of the local administration was even worse than that of the executive. The majority of the magistracy and municipality of Belfast are notoriously of Orange politics. The police force stood still in the presence of every species of crime. Finally, juries refuse to convict; and the Attorney-General is obliged to abandon the prosecutions, and order the prisoners on all sides to be discharged. The law is publicly proved powerless to avenge open and deliberate murder. If we read of such a state of things in Kansas, or Nebraska, we should be disposed to question the account.

It is difficult, indeed, to comprehend upon what principles the chief offices of the Irish executive are at present occupied. The Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (if a Lord Lieutenant is to be maintained at all) ought naturally to be some wealthy and dignified nobleman connected with the country by birth or property, who would feel a pride in maintaining with some degree of splendour the court of Her Majesty's Viceroy. Lord Wodehouse, on the contrary, is a young man, with some slight experience of diplomatic business, but no possible knowledge of Ireland, to whom the salary is a consideration, and who shows the extent to which it is so by driving about on state occasions with job-horses. O'Connell used to say that the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant was always appointed on the "shave-beggar" principle. (A barber in Kerry allowed his apprentices to practise shaving on the beggars. So a politician who was unfit for office in England was sent to the Castle.) When Mr. Cardwell, a conscientious statesman,

* Quoted from the charge of Baron Deasy at the Assizes.

but without the courage of his convictions, resigned office, after an administration full of good intentions without any issue, and Sir Robert Peel was appointed in his place, it was said, "The reign of Hugger Mugger is succeeded by the reign of Harum Scarum." But Harum Scarum is a very weak word to typify the confusion which the Right Honourable Baronet has produced in the administration of the country, and the terror with which his career is watched by the best friends of the Liberal party in Ireland. The only policy that can be assigned for such an appointment on Lord Palmerston's part, is a desire to break utterly with the Catholics of Ireland, then beginning to waver in their support, and to bid for the support of the northern Tory Protestants, who had previously been supporters of Lord Derby, but who are far more Protestant than Conservative in all their political proclivities. Every act of the Irish executive since has certainly been of that complexion and in that direction; and if Sir Robert Peel is popular anywhere in Ireland at this moment, it is in the Orange lodges.

Is it, then, impossible to produce in Ireland an executive capable of justifying the confidence of the country? Is a "shave-beggar secretary" one of the necessary links of British connexion? If Lord Palmerston were to send Sir Robert Peel as ambassador to Washington, every one knows the act would produce an outcry sufficient to destroy the ministry. If such a person were intruded upon the executive of Scotland, even Malachi Malagrowther would become simply unmanageable. Is it less impolitic in the interest of peace and good government to send him to Ireland? It is the grossest reflection certainly that can be made upon the public spirit of the Irish members of Parliament, that such an administration can receive from them the degree of toleration and connivance that it does. A country that does not resent the ignominy of being managed by such a ministry can hardly be said to understand the uses of Parliamentary government. With such an executive it is a certain consequence to have a corresponding local administration. When we find the Chief Secretary attacking the Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas in Parliament, because he complained at a northern Assizes that the magistrates had only committed for prosecution Catholic rioters in a party affray provoked by some Orange demonstration, every enemy of impartial justice throughout Ulster knows that the Castle is in the conspiracy; and in Ireland the Castle is a power more like the French Ministry of the Interior than like any other governmental authority known to the empire. Such a

speech communicates its own evil courage to every Orange magistrate in every court of Petty Sessions throughout the extent of Ulster, and was in all probability not without considerable influence in the complete failure of justice which has just occurred at Belfast. The great argument against a Conservative ministry on the part of the Catholics of Ireland used to be, that when there was a Tory Lord Lieutenant and a Tory Secretary at the Castle, no matter how estimable they might be personally, the whole old faction of Protestant ascendancy became suddenly animated with an intolerable malignity, and displayed its confidence of immunity in a thousand acts of petty power. But what Conservative Chief Secretary would dare to show his contempt and detestation of the authorities of the Catholic Church, to make light of and deny the distress of the people, to permit the Orangemen of the north such a complete triumph over law and order as they have had during the last year, to declare that the maintenance of the Church Establishment in its integrity was a point of honour with the ministry, to condemn a Catholic Chief Justice for presuming to administer the law impartially, and gradually to bring the principal patronage of the Crown again almost exclusively into Protestant hands? These have been the leading acts of Sir Robert Peel's administration; and it is no wonder, accordingly, that the Orange journals throughout Ireland are completely content, and are gradually weaning their readers from the old traditional connexion of the Irish Protestants with the English Conservative leaders.

While Lord Palmerston lives and reigns, of course this state of things can only proceed from bad to worse. It is understood that the appointment of Sir Robert Peel to Ireland was his own individual act, contrary to the unanimous protest of all his colleagues in the Cabinet; and in the same way that the Chief Secretary has been maintained and encouraged in the policy he has since chosen to pursue by the Prime Minister alone. The ministry, or at least the peculiar ascendancy of Lord Palmerston, cannot last for ever, however; and if it be true that the Premier will be raised to the House of Lords at the end of the present Parliament, his successors will find that, unless it is desirable altogether to relinquish the support of the Irish Catholics, it will become a principal question of the Cabinet to have a decided and comprehensive Irish policy, and to carry it out with energy.

What may we imagine such a policy to be? A minister, who desired to govern Ireland to the best advantage, should, in the first place, be most careful in the selection of his Chief Secretary. The Chief Secretary should have, as Mr. Cardwell

had, all the authority that a seat in the Cabinet can give him, unless the Prime Minister should be prepared, as Mr. Pitt and as Sir Robert Peel were on certain occasions, to take the principal responsibility of the carriage of their Irish policy. The Irish Lord Lieutenant and Secretary will always have their little cabinet, very often their two conflicting cabals, at the Castle. Even this is a sufficiently important point to be a matter of express consideration and direction on the part of a wise statesman. The present Secretary is, it is said, usually advised by Mr. Lawson, the Attorney-General, and Mr. Justice Keogh. It would be difficult to find two men in their condition better qualified to assist him in going astray.

The general policy of an imperial statesman, with regard to Ireland, ought to be, as fast as Parliament will permit him, to assimilate the laws of Ireland to those which regulate the public economy and form the constitutional bond of connexion between all the other countries belonging to the empire. No English statesman would dream of imposing such an establishment as that of the Protestant Church in Ireland upon any other dependency of the Crown. Why maintain it as a point of conscience and honour in Ireland? But, it may be said, Parliament will not in our days consent to its absolute disendowment. Perhaps not. But is there no possible compromise in the matter? The tender of a *Regium Donum* to the Catholic clergy, which has been again and again contemplated, never received, and is not likely to receive, much encouragement from either hierarchy, priesthood, or people. But there are other questions upon which they feel so much a more immediate and vital interest than even in that of the Church Establishment, that, were those questions speedily settled by a bold and honest minister, in all probability the sinecurists of the Irish Church might rest at their ease for the space of another generation. What possible reason of state can be given for the maintenance of mixed education in Ireland contrary to the uniform practice of all the other kingdoms, colonies, and dependencies of the empire? Whatever effect the Queen's Colleges may have had in producing a class of clever answerers at competitive examinations, they have notoriously failed to effect the results which their founders contemplated. Would their advantage to the Civil Service be very severely prejudiced if they were settled upon a basis satisfactory to the Catholics of the country, for whose benefit they were especially built? Is there any exception to the general character of Imperial policy so cogent as that the Catholics of Ireland must be denied a chartered Catholic university or a Catholic college attached to the common university (only at

the examination for degrees) such as the Catholics of Canada and the Catholics of New South Wales have under the Queen's Sign Manual? There can be no difficulty with any of these concessions in point of general principle or the accepted rules of policy; nor are the details of any considerable complicity or moment. Nor can any measures be conceived that would spread such an immediate and wholesome feeling of satisfaction throughout the country. The question of the condition of landlord and tenant is infinitely more difficult. But it is an inevitable question to a statesman who would really apply himself to establish good government, on the basis of wise laws, in Ireland. Such a minister would not allow himself to be checked by the cry of "Rights of Property," "Socialism," "Communism." He would study the relations of the Irish tenantry with their landlords, as Arthur Young described them ninety years ago, as the Devon Commission found them twenty years ago, and as in great measure they remain to-day. He would see that there are hundreds of laws on the Statute Book regulating land tenure in Ireland, and that they are all made in favour of the landlord and against the tenant; and that, except in three or four counties, the custom of the country is based upon the law, and is even more vicious and stronger than the law. The difficulty of inducing Parliament to legalize the Ulster custom of tenant right throughout the other provinces may be insuperable. But is it impossible (Mr. Cardwell's Act being admittedly an utter failure) to pass such a measure as Lord Derby proposed in 1845 when a member of Sir Robert Peel's Government, or again such as was proposed by the Irish executive of his administration in 1852? This ought to be possible, and much more than this ought to be possible. The Irish people are an agricultural people, and never can be to any considerable extent a manufacturing one; and it ought to be the first point in the policy of a minister who wished to govern them well, to give them every reasonable facility for access to and every possible power of legally acquiring property in land. The sale and transfer of land should be in every possible way facilitated, and, so far as the State can do so, the growth of a peasant proprietary encouraged. The right of distraint should be limited to cases where the tenure is by lease. Every law affecting the relation of landlord and tenant in Ireland, for which an existing valid reason cannot be shown, should be summarily repealed, so as, at all events, to give greater scope for equity and common sense on the part of the tribunals, where it is continually complained that the judges are compelled by the settled tradition and prejudice of the law to administer what

they feel to be injustice. The maintenance of evicted tenants, who may become paupers, should be strictly charged upon the property from which they come. It is difficult to deal with the question of absenteeism; but it is so excessive an evil in Ireland, that it is fairly open to consideration whether it would not be reasonable to charge systematic absentees with a larger proportion than they at present pay of the local taxation, and especially of the poor-rate.

A minister who would deal with the social and religious questions which torture the Irish people in this spirit and to these ends, would earn and deserve an enduring fame; and although he would probably never live to see Ireland as contented with its place in the empire as Scotland is, and might, on the other hand, live to see the demand for a local legislature formidably renewed, he would still have well served both countries, and might in a very real sense claim to have done what Napoleon III. boasts of his own government—to have found society on its apex and replaced it on its base.

The condition of the public mind in Ireland at this moment is exceedingly unhealthy. It is discontented, desponding, disaffected, suspicious, hopeless, and uncharitable. Disaffection against the Government is, we believe, far more widely spread than it was in 1848, or even in 1797. Disaffection against the authority of the Church is also, we suspect, more general, and it is certainly more openly testified than at any previous period that we can recall. In certain recent elections, opposition to the influence of the priesthood was an overt element; and it is said that one of the principal motives which induced the Hierarchy to take so prominent a part in founding the National Association recently established in Dublin, was the alarming spread of Fenian and other secret seditious societies throughout the country. "A conquered nation," wrote a great thinker, as well as a great priest, Father Faber, "is a tiresome spectacle. But never is it so disheartening as when it is tossing in unhelpful and inefficacious sedition, without rising to the heroism of a crusade for freedom"—or, he might have added, without wisely accepting and zealously improving the conditions in which it is actually placed. But Ireland can hardly be called a conquered country. Rather as the writer of the letters, whose title we have prefixed to this article, states the case:—

1. Ireland labours under certain disadvantageous conditions of the law, which are either not common to England, or owing to circumstances are not proportionately so injurious to England.

2. Ireland is not in a state of slavery, but has a certain power and force

conceded to her in the constitution, which if used aright is adequate at least to the amelioration of her condition, to her further enfranchisement, and to the wholesome nationalization of her institutions.

3. Ireland does not exercise adequately the constitutional powers which she possesses for her own amelioration.

If this is, as we take it to be, a true exposition of the actual political condition of Ireland, manifestly "a crusade for freedom" would be a great crime against every law, human and divine. But let us, for the sake of argument, suppose the case to be otherwise, and deal with the question of an Irish insurrection simply as a question of fact and detail. An insurrection is a military operation, and the conditions upon which all military operations, but especially insurrections, can be conducted, have been reduced within a remarkably close compass within the last fifteen years. Before that period the presumption was rather in favour of the sudden multitudinous strength of a popular movement, partly magnetizing, partly paralyzing the action of regular troops. In 1843, the "ugly rush" of an enthusiastic monster meeting upon even the force that the Government had arranged at Clontarf, might have had a different result from what was contemplated at the Castle. In 1848, the insurrection everywhere throughout Europe—not merely in Paris, but in Vienna, Berlin, Milan—overcame the regular army in the first instance. The military advantage was on the side of the barricades—the uprising, undisciplined masses against scientific ability, drill, discipline, and organized force. The way in which General Cavaignac handled the insurrection of June, 1848, has probably put an end to street revolutions, even in Paris; and the secret of it was, that he used artillery as freely as if he was fighting on the plains of Flanders. But since 1848, it is no exaggeration to say, that the power of regular troops as against an insurrection, whether in the streets or in the field, has been specifically quadrupled. The force of artillery has become more and more, and tends to become still more and more, the critical force in every species of military operation; and it has, at the same time, become so complex and scientific an arm that it can only be used with effect by a highly-educated corps. Again, the improvement in the musketry of the ordinary infantry gives them an immense advantage in dealing with insurgents over the soldiers who carried "Brown Bess." In 1798, a mob of pikemen might rush on a line of infantry with considerable chances of comparative impunity in their favour. The percentage of "Brown Bess" bullets which found their billet according to aim was very small indeed. But there is

no mistake about the Enfield rifle. The experience of the Armstrong gun in China in the same way gives some idea of what the use of the modern artillery would be in a contest with irregular forces. It was a common practice to drop a shell in a distant group of Tartar skirmishers, utterly destroying the illusion of some great advantage of ground they imagined they were gaining. But, apart from these considerations, let us realize to ourselves the policy of insurrection in the history of our own immediate days. We have recently witnessed the complete suppression of one, and we are in the act of witnessing the expiring agonies of another, of the most formidable insurrections recorded in human history. Poland had everything in its favour that a European insurrection could possibly have—a gallant military population, unexhausted by famine or emigration; homogeneous, united in all its ranks and classes, well supplied with funds and arms, with excellent officers, and a country peculiarly adapted for insurrectionary warfare; supported by the popular sympathies of a great part of Europe, and directly aided by the moral force of all the leading powers, except Prussia. Nevertheless, the Czar's heel has trodden the insurrection out, ember by ember. In America the chances were, perhaps, more even. The North had from the first the preponderance of numbers—no greater preponderance, however, than Russia has over Poland, or England over Ireland. But the South had at the head of its army the ablest general whom the world has seen since the Duke of Wellington, sustained by a set of divisional commanders such as Jackson, Longstreet, Beauregard, who might not unfairly be compared with Bonaparte's best lieutenants. They had almost the entire staff of the United States army for officers, a great superiority in the artillery and engineering departments, a more military and more united population at their command; and the sympathies of the external world were in their way almost as strong, throughout England perhaps stronger, than they were for Poland. In the end, however, the more solidly organized Government has told as against the insurrection. Nor is it even probable that the chances of an Irish insurrection would be seriously increased in the case of England's being simultaneously engaged in a foreign war. If that war were with the United States, Ireland would, indeed, be a formidable power to reckon with; but only in the way we have already stated, on the American continent, and as supplying, perhaps, the most numerous and determined contingent of the American army. To carry an expedition across the Atlantic in these days of iron-cased frigates and floating batteries, would be a sheer impossibility; and when Lord Robert

Cecil said that the Irish were emigrating at the rate of an army a year, he, in more than one point of view, defined the position. For it is the men of the military age—the men who, in a continental country, would be subject to conscription, that have in the main left Ireland. But if these are arguments to those who require arguments from other than moral grounds, against the “unhelpful and inefficacious sedition,” which is so grievous a political malady in Ireland, surely they are arguments also for the consideration of statesmen who may have to cope with the consequences of an American war, aggravated by their neglect or misgovernment of Ireland.

It is said to have been chiefly in consequence of their alarm at the growth of disaffection, and of the organization of secret societies in Ireland, that many of the bishops, who have not taken any public part in politics for the last ten years, appeared so prominently on the occasion of the foundation of the new National Association, established at Dublin towards the close of last year. It is, we think, to be regretted that this movement was postponed until the eve of a general election. Such an association would have been, at all events, far more certain of success had it been inaugurated immediately after the bishops issued their great Pastoral on the subject of the grievances of Ireland five years ago. How far, under present circumstances, it will succeed in forwarding the important ends contemplated by its promoters, time will determine. It is probable, indeed, that the power of political associations over the country at large is seriously diminished since O’Connell’s time, and even since the time of the Catholic Defence Association and the Tenant League; and that more may and can be effectively done by local action.

In this point of view the best advice that has been given of late years to the Irish clergy and to the Irish people in general is, to our mind, contained in that part of the letters of R. D. O. where he advises local concert in their respective constituencies to as many of the Catholic independent electors as can by possibility be induced to pull together, in order to select beforehand efficient representatives, and as far as possible return them to Parliament free of expense. The course which the City of Westminster is at this moment pursuing with a view to the election of the eminent philosopher, Mr. John Stuart Mill, is an excellent example. The only difficulty in the way of its general application throughout Ireland, or at least the Irish Catholic constituencies, is said to be that settled state of rancour in which one section of the constituency habitually lives with regard to the other. But here, as R. D. O. says:—

It will be a good thing for Ireland if those patriots who believe themselves to be purer and more devoted than their neighbours, will for a season deal more tenderly with the characters of the poor publicans and sinners who constitute a considerable proportion of every constituency.

It will be a good thing if Irishmen will learn to act earnestly together, with charity in their hearts, and with temperance in their speech. There is no occasion to temporize with anything that is false or vicious—no occasion to adopt our neighbour's errors, because we will not shut the door against him; but there is great need that those who have the means and power to serve the country should unite to do so with a spirit in which personal rancour has no place.

If betimes they receive scant credit for their honest exertions, it is only what has happened to better men in all ages. Their duty is to go on serving their country to the best of their ability in the station to which they are called, and in the end they will have their reward.

If such a system were adopted, there is no reason why the small, but by no means inefficient Irish Catholic party in Parliament might not at the general election be recruited by from a dozen to a score of useful members. At present that seems a sufficient object for which to invite some sacrifice of feeling. By what we cannot help regarding as a Providential indication, the Catholics in the Lower House have, throughout the present Parliament, held almost to a unit the balance of power between parties. The result is that the leaders on both sides of the House have become exceedingly cautious—not to say considerate—in their treatment of Catholic questions. It requires, in our belief, only some little additional organization of political power, and its wise and temperate, but very earnest application as occasions offer in Parliament, to persuade one of the coming statesmen of the next ten years, Mr. Gladstone, if not Mr. Disraeli, that it is his interest and, in a sense, his necessity to have a clear and comprehensive policy for Ireland. If Ireland was contributing her part in the shape of able and reliable public men to the development of such a policy, and every session enabled them to report still further progress in its prosecution, there would be, at least, as little room for secret societies as there was during the agitation of Repeal by O'Connell, or of Tenant Right by Duffy and Lucas. It is only when the people have lost confidence in the veracity and integrity of their natural guides that they betake themselves to these wretched aggregations of unhelpful and inefficacious sedition.

THE ENCYCLICAL AND SYLLABUS.

Pii Divinâ Providentiâ Papæ IX. Epistola Encyclica ad omnes Patriarchas, Primates, Archiepiscopos et Episcopos, Dec. 8, 1864.

Syllabus complectens præcipuos nostræ ætatis errores qui notantur in Allocutionibus Consistorialibus, in Encyclicis aliisque Apostolicis Literis Sanctissimi Domini Nostri Pii Papæ IX.

HARDLY any Pontificate in the whole history of the Church has so abounded in important doctrinal pronouncements as that of Pius IX. Firstly, he has put forth an actual definition of faith; and that, too, distinguished from all others by more than one characteristic circumstance. Alone among such definitions (as has been often observed) it condemned no existing error; insomuch that the Catholic's joy and exultation at this fresh proclamation of divinely revealed truth was saddened by no regret for condemned heretics or for brethren fallen from the faith. Then, again, never was there a definition which exhibited in so clear a light the Church's august prerogative, of developing implicit dogma into an explicit portion of the One Faith. For how was the doctrine of Our Lady's Immaculate Conception circumstanced during that eventful December of 1854? On the 7th of that month no Catholic was permitted to stigmatize its denial as *unsound*; on the 8th, all Catholics were *required* to regard such denial as *heretical*.

With how much delight and gratitude Pius IX. contemplates the fact of his having been permitted to define that magnificent verity, is shown in the very Encyclical before us; for he dates it expressly and formally on the tenth anniversary of the definition. Yet his reign has been no less remarkable for those other doctrinal determinations, which, though not definitions of faith, yet peremptorily claim the interior assent of his spiritual children. The Church's whole doctrine on his civil principedom,* as regards its methodical expression, has been commenced, matured, and perfected by him. And over how

* It would much conduce, we think, to theological clearness if the distinction were carefully preserved, which is made in this Encyclical between the "temporalis potestas" (see Prop. xxiv.) and the "civilis principatus." For ourselves, at all events, we hope as far as possible to keep these respective terms to distinct senses. By the Pope's "civil principedom" we shall understand the authority which he possesses as King over his temporal subjects in Italy; and by his "temporal power" the temporal power (whatever its nature and extent) which he possesses simply as Pontiff over his spiritual subjects throughout the world.

large a field of thought his other determinations have ranged, is emphatically testified by the document which he has now published. For the annexed Syllabus contains exclusively former pronouncements of Pius IX. himself; and every one, friend or foe, has been alike struck with the extent of ground which it covers.

And there is one circumstance which makes this fertility of authoritative doctrine peculiarly impressive and significant. It might have been expected, indeed, that the period of such fertility should have been one of much *intellectual* excitement and commotion; but no one could have anticipated so large an accession to theological first principles, unless the Pontiff were enjoying material peace and tranquillity. On the contrary, no Pontiff of modern times has been involved through his whole reign in so unrelenting a succession of political distresses. He has been "in peril from his own kindred, in peril from the nations, in peril from false brethren;" while burdened in a fuller sense than was S. Paul himself, with "the solicitude of all the Churches." Yet none of these things has lessened his zeal for doctrine. It was when an exile at Gaeta that he first addressed himself to that definition of faith which was to be the glory of his pontificate. And now, when the Franco-Italian Convention has been concluded, and his civil principedom is once more exposed to urgent and imminent peril, instead of seeking safety by silence and compromise, he expresses solemnly and stringently that very aspect of Christian truth, which will be most offensive to modern princes in general, and to the French Emperor in particular.

It is time, however, to pass from these general remarks to that particular pronouncement which has given us the occasion of making them. The third article of our last number was written at a time when we had no expectation whatever of this new utterance from Rome; and yet had we known that such utterance was coming, we could hardly have better prepared the way for its due appreciation. In that article we treated on the noblest Encyclical ever issued by Gregory XVI.; and we have now to consider that which, if we include the Syllabus, will undoubtedly prove the noblest ever issued by his successor, even though the life of Pius were prolonged for as many years as his most affectionate children could desire. Not only (which is a matter of course) there is a deep identity of doctrine between the two, but there is no small resemblance both in some of their attendant circumstances, and in the tone of indignant reprobation which they both display. In 1832, as in 1864, there were Catholics, filled with a zeal which is not according to knowledge, who maintained that the organization

of modern society, with its characteristic "liberties," is the fullest exemplification of true social principle which the world has seen. In 1832, as in 1864, the reigning Pontiff did not content himself with condemning this monstrous exaggeration, but authoritatively decreed that the speculative basis, on which those liberties are more commonly defended, is directly contrary to Catholic truth. If Gregory XVI. denounced as an "insanity" the tenet "that liberty of conscience is to be vindicated for each man," Pius IX. no less emphatically declares (prop. lxxix.) that the liberty of worships and of the press conduces to the corruption of morals and the propagation of a pestilential indifferentism. At the same time there is this very important difference between the two. Gregory XVI. put forth his Encyclical at the beginning of his reign; and its doctrinal decisions refer only to that particular error which was then in the ascendant. But Pius IX. is addressing the Church after many years of teaching and governing—years which have brought him into conflict with a vast and heterogeneous mass of hideous error. He now judges that the time has come for summing up the results of that conflict. He includes, therefore, in one large Apostolic denunciation a great number of tenets, both philosophical and strictly theological; and he condemns them in company with those politico-religious errors, which altogether savour of the same school, though in themselves they are of course indefinitely less grievous than the great majority of tenets herein censured.

Now, firstly, as to the authority possessed by this Encyclical over the interior convictions of a Catholic. We have no hesitation in maintaining, consistently with our article on the "*Mirari Vos*," that its doctrinal declarations possess absolute infallibility, in virtue of the promises made by Christ to S. Peter's Chair. Indeed, to hold that the Church's infallibility is confined to her definitions of faith seems to us among the most fatal errors of the day; nor do we see where its legitimate results can stop, short of that extreme form of Catholic misbelief which animated the late "*Home and Foreign Review*." The tenet which would thus limit the Church's infallibility is regarded by Viva and some other writers as heretical; several, such as Lugo, do not go so far as this, yet denounce it as theologically unsound; and theologians commonly (on Lugo's testimony) at all events reject it as untrue.* But a still stronger refutation of this tenet is supplied by the acts and words of the Holy See itself, than could be obtained by the united voice of all theologians. For instance, what words can be stronger and

* DUBLIN REVIEW for January, 1865, p. 45.

more explicit than those in which Gregory claimed infallibility for the "*Mirari vos*," of which no one ever dreamt that it was a definition of faith? Lamennais appealed in the first instance to the Pope's "*infallible*" authority;* and the Pope (through Cardinal Pacca) informed him that, in like manner, "on every side the episcopate" had "addressed itself to the Apostolic Chair to obtain a solemn decision from the *infallible* mouth of S. Peter's successor." The Pope acceded, he says, to this double request. To what request? There had been no request at all, except that Gregory would pronounce an *infallible* judgment on the doctrines in question. And in the following year he announced to the Archbishop of Toulouse that he had given the said decision as "presiding over the Church in his (S. Peter's) name, whose faith resists all errors,"† i. e. as successor to S. Peter's *infallibility*. Afterwards, again through Cardinal Pacca, he complained that Lamennais had not "followed the example of so many" great men who "submitted themselves to the responses of *Peter's infallible mouth*"‡ The "*Mirari Vos*," then, was regarded by him who issued it as a "response of Peter's infallible mouth." But if the "*Mirari vos*" is an infallible utterance of Peter, even more manifestly must this "*Quantâ Curâ*," with its appended Syllabus, be so considered. As to the errors recited in the latter, their condemnation is as accurately "formalized"§ as is Innocent XII.'s condemnation of Fénelon, or Alexander VIII.'s of relaxed morality. But even as to the Encyclical itself, there is throughout a far more manifest appearance on the surface than in the "*Mirari Vos*" of its being intended as a doctrinal decree.|| Moreover, there occurs in it one very explicit statement to which no parallel can be found in the earlier Encyclical,—a statement which can leave no possible doubt in any one's mind that the Holy Father is speaking *ex cathedrâ* as the teacher of all Christians. "Therefore," he says, "by our Apostolic authority we reprobate, proscribe, and condemn all and singular the evil opinions and doctrines severally mentioned in this letter, and will and command that they be thoroughly (*omnino*) regarded by all children of the Catholic Church as reprobated, proscribed, and condemned." Such is the relation between these two Encyclicals. Since, therefore, it is absolutely indubitable on Catholic principles that the doctrinal declarations issued by Gregory XVI. in the earlier one were infallibly true, there is no

* DUBLIN REVIEW for January, 1865, p. 54.

† Ibid., p. 55.

§ See Ibid., p. 44.

‡ Ibid., p. 57.

|| See Ibid., pp. 47-8.

room for doubt or question that those now issued by Pius IX. are infallible also.*

But as on the one hand the "*Quantâ Curâ*" falls in such sense under our argument of January that its infallibility is thereby most firmly established, so reciprocally the "*Quantâ Curâ*" itself furnishes us with many signal confirmations of that argument. It gives us several further reasons (though surely no further reasons were needed) for holding, both that there is a class of infallible declarations altogether distinct from definitions of faith, and also that the said class is very far indeed from being either small in extent or inconsiderable in importance. Firstly, then, let the following extract be most carefully pondered :—

Nor can we pass over in silence the audacity of those who, not enduring sound doctrine, contend that without sin and without any sacrifice of the Catholic profession, assent and obedience may be refused to those judgments and decrees of the Holy See, whose object is declared to concern the Church's general good, and her rights and discipline, so only it do not touch the dogmata of faith and morals. But no one can be found not clearly and distinctly to see and understand how grievously this is opposed to the Catholic dogma of the full power given from God by Christ Himself to the Roman Pontiff, of feeding, ruling, and guiding the Universal Church.

Now those unsound Catholics who are at this time so dangerous, will sometimes admit that *obedience* is due to Papal commands of this character; but they are unanimous in maintaining that no *interior assent* is required, except to definitions of faith. It is most important, therefore, to point out, that reference is made in this passage to two different kinds of pronouncement from Rome; "judgments" which determine concerning truth or falsehood, and "decrees" or practical commands. For the former the Pope claims "assent" of the intellect; for the latter "obedience" of the will. No one, we think, can read the sentence with candour without seeing that such is its sense; but there is a further circumstance which establishes that sense beyond the possibility of doubt. Pius IX. declares that the error in question denies the Pope's true power of "*feeding (pascendi)*, ruling, and guiding the Church." Now what is the chief ecclesiastical sense of this word "*pascendi*"? It means principally "teaching;" and it is here fixed to that sense by the circumstance that the Pope's other

* We so worded our former article all through as to save the Gallican theory, for the purpose of making clearer the precise point which we maintained; but we never concealed our dissent from that theory. We admit, of course, that Gallicans cannot consistently regard the "*Quanta Curâ*" as infallible, until it has received express or tacit adhesion from the Episcopate.

powers of "ruling and guiding" are separately mentioned.* Sound doctrine is constantly described under the figure of healthy pasture: the office of feeding, accordingly, is that of guiding the flock into healthy pasture, and preserving it from poisonous herbage; or (in other words, and dropping the metaphor) of inculcating truth and denouncing error. The image in question may be found fully drawn out in the opening sentence of this very Encyclical. It is quite certain, then, that the Pope condemns the proposition just recited, as denying the full power given to the Roman Pontiff of inculcating true doctrine on the universal Church. But this cannot by any possibility be the case, unless the said proposition claims a wrongful exemption, not merely from the duty of obeying the Pope's commands, but also from that of believing his declarations.

Here, therefore, we will confine ourselves to this particular—the yielding interior assent to Papal judgments—and put aside for the moment that other question which concerns obedience to Papal precepts. Pius IX., then, teaches (1) that the Pope is in the habit of putting forth certain "judgments" which "do not touch the dogmas of faith and morals," but "whose object is declared [by him] to regard the Church's rights, discipline, and general good." His declarations on his civil principedom may be given as instances in point. Pius IX. teaches (2) that interior assent cannot be refused to these judgments "without sin and sacrifice of the Catholic profession." (3) He rests this obligation of interior assent, not at all on the fact that the Pope is very much more likely to be right on such matters than a private Catholic,† but distinctly on the claim of infallibility. A moment's consideration will show this. No one doubts that the Pope claims infallibility, in exercising that power of "feeding" or teaching the universal Church, which he has received from Christ.‡ But Pius here instructs us that the issuing this particular class of declarations

* A passage strikingly parallel occurs in the Munich Brief. "The most grave office entrusted to Us by Christ the Lord Himself, of ruling and moderating (*moderandi*) His Universal Church, and *feeding all His flock with the pastures of salutary doctrine.*"

† We have urged in a former number (July, 1863, pp. 71-79), that under certain circumstances a certain interior assent may be reasonably claimed, for such a reason, to utterances which are not actually infallible; and we hope to pursue the same kind of thought in a future article on the Pontifical Congregations.

‡ No one doubts, we say, that the Pope *claims* infallibility in exercising this power; though Gallicans deny that he possesses it, unless he is supported in his judgment by the general episcopate.

falls within that power; he instructs us, therefore, that this class of declarations is infallibly true.

Let us suppose, then, that the Catholic episcopate, expressly or tacitly, adheres to the "*Quantâ Curâ*:" the whole *Ecclesia Docens* will then claim infallibility, not for those Papal declarations only which "touch the dogmas of faith and morals," but for those also which bear on "the Church's rights, discipline, and general good." But to suppose that the *Ecclesia Docens* can claim an infallibility which she does not possess, is (as we have so often urged) to shake her authority to its very centre: a Catholic who could dream of such a supposition is already on the high road to apostasy.

One explanation more is necessary. Pius IX. supposes that such a declaration "does not touch the dogmata of faith and morals." He must mean of course that it does not *directly* touch them; for if it bears (as he himself expresses it) on "the Church's rights, discipline, and general good," it cannot but have an indirect connection with those dogmas.

2. No Catholic may doubt that declarations put forth by the Pontiff, in his capacity of universal teacher, if accepted by the episcopate, are infallibly true; and it is the habit, therefore, of our opponents to maintain, that all those declarations of the Pope which are not definitions of faith, are put forth by him, not as universal teacher but as a private doctor. The present Encyclical must dispose of such a pretence for ever. We might indeed, had the thought occurred to us, have exposed its fallacy, when discussing the "*Mirari Vos*" in our last number. That pronouncement was assuredly no definition of faith; yet in a subsequent Encyclical ("*Singulari Nos*," July 10, 1834), Gregory informs the bishops that on that earlier occasion he had declared true doctrine *to the whole Catholic flock* (and here again, observe, is the same illustration to which the word "*pascendi*" refers), *according to the function of his office*.* In regard, however, to the "*Quantâ Curâ*," there is no need of consulting any other declaration, to understand its claim and bearing: it speaks for itself. The Pope, as already quoted, "wills and commands" that the errors censured in it "be thoroughly held by all children of the Catholic Church, as reprobated, proscribed, and condemned." If our opponents can argue that he says this as a private doctor and not as universal teacher, they must have forgotten the meaning of words. Still more emphatically in the Syllabus, he teaches

* *Encyclicis nostris literis datis die 15 Augusti, anni 1832; quibus sanam et quam sequi unice fas sit doctrinam, de propositis ibidem capitibus, pro nostri officii munere Catholico gregi universo denunciavimus.*

that "all Catholics ought most firmly to hold" that doctrine which he had delivered on his civil principedom. When he is instructing "all Catholics" what doctrine they are "most firmly to hold," in what imaginable capacity can he be speaking, except in that of universal teacher?

3. We assumed in our January article (p. 46) that there are certain declarations of the Pope, which are not in form addressed to the universal Church, but which nevertheless are "intended for publication (as is shown by the circumstances of the case), with the purpose of inculcating some doctrine on the whole Church as theologically certain, or of denouncing some tenet to the whole Church as theologically unsound;" and to such declarations we ascribed infallibility. The reader has just seen that these two Encyclicals are exactly cases in point. But since our opponents are often extremely reluctant to believe more than actual necessity requires, it is imaginable (though we are not aware it has ever been attempted) that they may draw a distinction between Encyclicals and other pronouncements. "The former," they may say, "as being addressed to the whole episcopate are in some sense addressed to the universal Church; but a Consistorial Allocution, or a letter to some individual pastor, can never be intended to inculcate Catholic doctrine on the whole body of the faithful." All such evasions are precluded by this glorious Encyclical. "Scarcely had we been elevated to this Chair of Peter," says Pius IX., "when . . . we raised our voice, and in many published *Encyclical Letters, Allocutions delivered in Consistory, and other Apostolic Letters*, we condemned the chief errors of this our most unhappy age . . . and admonished . . . all children of the Catholic Church that they should abhor" the pestilence. He places in one class Encyclicals, Allocutions, and other Apostolic Letters; he unites them in the common category of "having been published by him;" and he says expressly that they were directed as warnings to "all children of the Catholic Church." Further, we find from the Syllabus,* that among these warnings thus put forth by him as universal teacher, are included not merely Encyclicals and Allocutions, but various letters to this or that individual pastor; to the Archbishops of Munich, Cologne, and Friburg, and to the Bishop of Breslau: not to mention one (prop. lxxiii.) which took the form of a letter to that spiritual rebel, the King of Sardinia.

4. In the same article (p. 43) we maintained that there are various facts, over and above those recorded in Scripture, on

* See on this subject Cardinal Antonelli's letter at the end of this article.

which the Church can infallibly pronounce, in consequence of their relation with dogma. Examples of this are props. lxxii., lxxvi., lxxvii., lxxix. Our doctrine, then, on this head, has received the Pope's direct sanction.

5. Lastly, a flood of light has been thrown on the truth of that doctrine, which we maintained in our last number, by the mode in which this Papal utterance has been received throughout the Catholic world. We wish that space permitted any justice to this theme; but we will give at least some indication of our meaning, by a few specimens of the language held by French bishops. Thus the illustrious Mgr. Parisis, bishop of Arras, in a letter to M. Baroche, dated January 18 :—

In the bull "Quantà Curà" *everything is doctrinal and even dogmatic.* This being laid down, your Excellence will understand that with us dogma is not a simple opinion. . . . *it is the Divine truth itself, sovereign, eternal, immovable as God. . . . You will say to me perhaps that all the condemnations pronounced . . . are not articles of faith.* As regards some of them I admit that they are not so in such sense as that those who did not admit them *would be on that account formally heretical* ; but not in such sense as that persons could reject them without being *guilty of great sin under the head of faith* (sans se rendre grandement coupables en matière de foi).

The Bishop of Luçon exhorts his priests "to adhere *in spirit and in heart*, after their bishop's example, to the decisions, condemnations, and instructions" therein contained. The Bishop of Beauvais "received the decisions of the supreme authority of Jesus Christ's vicar *with the most entire submission of mind and heart*," and well knows that on this head there is no difference between his priests' opinion and his own. The Bishop of Fréjus declares that the Encyclical is "*a rule of faith which every Catholic is bound to accept.*" But to cite one bishop is to cite all.*

* Since our article has been in type, we have received a number of the "Monde," containing a French translation of the "sacred invitation" issued by the Cardinal Vicar of Rome, on occasion of his fixing the time for gaining the Jubilee indulgence. There is no document, not directly Papal, which can have so much weight as this in determining the true sense and authority of the Encyclical ; for it is addressed to the Catholics of Pius IX.'s own diocese, by his express sanction, and under his very eye. The following passage deserves careful attention, as bearing on the theme before us. Cardinal Patrizi has been recounting generally various errors condemned in the Encyclical, and he thus proceeds :—

"The faithful, who show themselves such in word and act, recognize in the voice of the Church's visible head *the very word of God. . . .* That head has authority to address the whole Church ; and he who listens not to him declares himself as no longer appertaining to the Church, as no longer making part of Christ's flock, and accordingly as no longer having a right to the eternal inheritance of Heaven."

The first sentence here quoted would suffice, indeed, to show, what is other-

We have been hitherto considering the authority of this "Quanta Cura," and the light which it throws on the authority of other Papal declarations: but our chief concern of course is with its actual contents. We cannot write a volume here, and we must make some selection, therefore, from the various matters which throng on us for consideration. Perhaps, on the whole, our most serviceable course will be to content ourselves with giving a general account, as accurate as we can make it, of the errors condemned and the contradictory truths inculcated; and with expressing our own humble impression of the Holy Father's general drift, in promulgating this most remarkable utterance. Such a course is the more appropriate, because at last the doctrines taught by him must be accepted on his infallible authority, and there is no need therefore of confirming them by argument. And our readers may be so desirous of seeing each separate class of the condemned errors distinctly treated, that for the sake of that advantage they will excuse the somewhat discursive and miscellaneous shape which our article must thus assume. At the same time it is hardly necessary to add, that wherever more than one view is possible on the meaning of some condemned proposition, we cannot express our own judgment, except in a spirit of profound deference and submission to those authorities whose right it is to determine the question. We will begin, then, with the Encyclical itself; and lay before our readers such a brief analysis, as may enable them (we hope) the more easily to follow its argumentative thread. Afterwards we will deal with the eighty propositions in order.

The Holy Father begins his Encyclical by reminding his "Venerable Brethren" of the earnest care which had been taken by Pontiffs in every age to warn the flock against poisoned pasture. In like manner, he adds, on mounting himself the pontifical throne, he had observed with keen grief the errors so widely prevalent, and had laboured constantly to denounce them: particularly certain monstrous delusions, from which almost all other errors spring, and which he emphatically con-

wise indubitable; viz., that the Cardinal Vicar does not impute actual heresy to those who withhold assent from the doctrine of the Encyclical. But his words cannot surely mean less than this:—that those who withhold such assent act inconsistently with their Catholic profession, assume a non-Catholic position, and are accordingly (while their indocility continues) excluded from the hope of Heaven. Here, then, we have a striking illustration and interpretation of that remarkable passage, quoted by us from the Encyclical a page or two back, which condemns the non-assent to such Papal judgments, as involving "sin and a certain sacrifice (jactura) of the Catholic profession." At the same time, we would submit to competent theologians a remark in our last number (p. 53) on the case of invincible ignorance in this matter.

demned in the years 1846, 1854, and 1862. But at this moment, he says, there are special errors prevailing, which result from those just recounted, and which require him again to speak: errors the more detestable, because they tend to deny the Church's authority over nations and civil rulers in their public capacity. The first step in this downward course is taken by those who dare to teach, that the best maxims for civil society, and those most suited to modern progress, require rulers to ignore the claims of doctrinal truth, and abandon the duty of chastising with temporal punishment offenders, as such, against the Catholic religion. From which most false theory of civil government they are led to advocate those insane tenets condemned by Gregory XVI. on liberty of worships and liberty of the press.

Here we pause to make two remarks:—Pius IX. not only denies that citizens have a *right* to such liberty, but he denies that the *best* condition of society involves its concession. Yet on the other hand he is very far from affirming that in countries where hereditary Protestantism has long existed, toleration should be refused to Protestants. (See our article on the "*Mirari Vos*," pp. 65-6.) And there is indeed one significant circumstance to be noted in this connection, as regards the appended Syllabus. On September 27, 1852, the Holy Father pronounced an Allocation on the unhappy state of New Grenada. Among other grievous circumstances, he deplores the fact that liberty of worships was permitted by the new constitution of that republic; and he also laments that by an earlier decree immigrants had been allowed the free exercise of their religion. Since religious unity had hitherto prevailed in this republic, such a statement in no respect proscribes the theory which we humbly maintain. But the Syllabus, now published for the guidance of the whole Church, contains the latter of these two judgments (prop. lxxviii.), while it omits the former. This admits of an obvious explanation. A Catholic ruler will very often act rightly in granting liberty of conscience to his non-Catholic *subjects*; but it can hardly ever be right to grant, in favour of *immigrants*, a freedom of public worship which would not otherwise exist. Religious unity, where it prevails, is so unspeakable a blessing, that a signal benefit is conferred on any such country, if non-Catholic immigrants are prevented, through the prevalent intolerance, from there settling.

As regards, however, the full toleration of Protestantism in a country where it has long taken root, we may cite for our conclusion the recent work of M. de Beaulieu; which has received the signal honour of a special approbation from the

Holy Father, transmitted through his private secretary. M. de Beaulieu is avowedly writing in reply to M. de Montalembert's uncatholic theory; yet he argues again and again, that the proper service of material force is to retain a country in that religious unity which she enjoys, but not to re-establish her in that which she has long unhappily lost. The following passage is an instance of this:—

You see clearly then that it is not by violence that we would bring back society [to true religion]. *It would be contrary to the very principle of Catholicism*: never has the Church wished to convert by force. Society indeed. . . . may have hindered, has even been bound to hinder (a pu, a dû même empêcher), the *introduction* of a dissent, of a heresy; even to restrain it [from progress] when it had actually forced its way to an entrance (était parvenue à pénétrer): but to expel it violently when it had in fact gained so extended a sway that the populations at large would no longer understand or desire the [exclusive reign of] the truth, thus to outrage them would have introduced disorders more serious than any good which might result; nor is such outrage commanded by principle any more than by prudence. The Church herself counsels us to endure a lesser evil in order to avoid a greater; principles and right remaining uncompromised—(P. 135).

A detailed consideration, however, of the precise doctrines ruled on this head by the Encyclical and Syllabus, belongs to a later part of our article. Here we will but add one caution. It by no means follows, because a Catholic ruler may be even bound to tolerate hereditary Protestants, that he can be justified by any possible circumstances in pursuing predominantly any other end than moral and spiritual good. We argued this question at length in our third article for July, 1863; and we will here quote Gregory XVI.'s well-known exhortation in the "Mirari Vos:"—

Let the princes, he says, our most dear children, regard their power and authority as conferred on them, not only for the world's government, *but most of all for the Church's protection*. Placed, as they are, in the position of parents and guardians to their peoples, they will procure for those peoples true, permanent, and profitable rest and tranquillity, if they apply themselves *chiefly* to this care, viz., that religion and piety towards God may be securely preserved.

We now return to the Encyclical; and in the course of our further analysis, we will add a line or two within brackets, to make clearer what we apprehend to be its argumentative connection. From this miserable rupture between Church and State, adds Pius IX., other and terrible evils necessarily follow. The nation having, in its corporate character, thrown off the yoke of true religion, proceeds to set at nought true morality: material force usurps the place of legitimate right, and public

opinion is installed as irresponsible sovereign. Then of what character is this public opinion? It is the opinion of a society which, having rebelled against religion and morality, has no ends left except the gratification of its own selfish desires. This detestable disposition shows itself in the various laws which are enacted against the religious orders and against almsgiving; it is also shown in the State's trampling on a father's right to provide, as his conscience may direct, for the education of his children; and it is fearfully exhibited in the anti-Christian nature of that education which the State proceeds to enforce.

[Then comes the lowest step of all. These wicked men begin by proclaiming a separation between Church and State, but they end by promoting an unholy union between the two. The State should be subordinate to the Church; they labour incessantly for a subordination of Church to State.] The maxims which they shamelessly profess involve the most overt and flagrant rebellion against the Church's indefeasible rights as an independent spiritual kingdom; and they elude her just authority on the monstrous pretext, that they are neither bound to believe the Pope's teaching nor to obey his commands, except precisely so far as these fall within the limits of faith and morals in the very strictest sense.

These, however, he adds, which he hereby condemns and calls on all the faithful to regard as condemnable, are very far from being all the errors of the time; for the evils caused by an irreligious and unrestricted press are innumerable. He next alludes to Rénan, whose impious book obtained in Italy so fearfully wide a circulation, and commends the bishops for their zeal against so shocking an outrage.

His chief consolation, indeed, he assures them, consists in his knowledge of their great zeal and loyalty to the Holy See. That zeal makes him confident that they will even redouble their efforts to protect their respective flocks from noxious pastures, and to instruct them in Catholic faith and morality. And if at all times, he adds, more particularly in such times as these, it is necessary that both pastors and faithful should with one united heart abound in prayer for the sanctification of Christians. Moreover, since that prayer is more acceptable which springs from a pure heart, he grants a plenary indulgence in the form of a jubilee, in order that the faithful may have the greater motive and facility for approaching the sacraments. Let us pray, he concludes, for ourselves and for others; let us appeal with confidence in these troubled times to our Immaculate Mother; let us ask the prayers of SS. Peter and Paul, and of all those saints in Heaven who, secure of their

own immortality, are anxious only for our salvation. And so he prays God to bless them, and gives his Apostolic benediction to them and to all clerics and laymen placed under their charge.

It will appear, on looking through the Encyclical, that all Catholics are required to regard the following propositions as "reprobated, proscribed, and condemned:" (1.) "The best constitution of public society, and [also] civil progress, altogether require that human society be conducted and governed without regard being had to religion any more than if it did not exist; or, at least, without any distinction made between the true religion and false ones." (2.) "That is the best condition of society in which no duty is recognized, as attached to the civil power, of restraining, by enacted penalties, offenders against the Catholic religion, except so far as the public peace may require." (3.) "Liberty of conscience and of worships is each man's personal right, which should be legally proclaimed and asserted in every well-constituted society: and a right resides in the citizens to an absolute liberty, which should be restrained by no authority whether ecclesiastical or civil, whereby they may be able openly and publicly to manifest and declare any whatever of their ideas, whether by word of mouth, by the press, or in any other way." (4.) "The people's will, manifested by what is called public opinion or in some other way, constitutes a supreme law, free from all divine and human control." (5.) "In the political order accomplished facts, from the very circumstance that they are accomplished, have the force of right." (6.) "Permission given by the civil power for citizens and the Church publicly to bestow alms in the name of Christian charity, is opposed to the principles of the best public economy." (7.) "The law imposed on Catholics of abstinence from servile work on certain fixed days because of God's worship is opposed to the principles of the best public economy." (8.) "Domestic society or the family derives the whole principle of its existence from the civil law alone."* (9.) "Consequently from the civil law alone issue and on it depend all rights of parents over their children: and especially that of providing for their education." (10.) "The clergy, as being hostile to the true and beneficial advance of science and civilization, should be removed from the whole charge and duty of instructing and educating youth."

* Some Protestant critics have absurdly supposed the Pope here to allege that the rights of family are derived from the Church—so ignorant are they on the very alphabet of Catholic social science. The Church teaches, as we need hardly inform our readers, that these rights come immediately from God.

(11.) "The Church's laws do not bind in conscience unless when they are promulgated by the civil power." (12.) "Acts and decrees of the Roman Pontiffs, relating to religion and the Church, need the civil power's sanction and approbation, or at least its consent." (13.) "The Apostolic constitutions, whereby secret societies are condemned (whether an oath of secrecy be or be not required in such societies), and whereby their frequenters and favourers are smitten with anathema,—have no force in those regions of the world wherein associations of the kind are tolerated by the civil government." (14.) "The excommunication pronounced by the Council of Trent and by Roman Pontiffs against those who assail and usurp the Church's rights and possessions, rests on a confusion between the spiritual and temporal orders, and is directed to the pursuit of a purely secular good." (15.) "The Church can decree nothing which binds the consciences of the faithful in regard to their use of temporal things." (16.) "The Church has no right of restraining by temporal punishment those who violate her laws." (17.) "It is conformable to the principles of sacred theology and public law to assert and claim for the civil government a right of property in those goods which are possessed by the Church, by the religious orders, and by other pious establishments." (18.) "The ecclesiastical power is not by Divine right distinct from, and independent of, the civil power; nor can such distinction and independence be preserved without the civil power's essential rights being assailed and usurped by the Church." (19.) "Without sin and without sacrifice of the Catholic profession, assent and obedience may be refused to those judgments and decrees of the Apostolic See, whose object is declared to concern the Church's general good and her rights and discipline, so only it do not touch the dogmata of faith and morals."

So far as these various propositions need comment, for a right apprehension of the Pope's meaning and drift in condemning them, such comment will be found in a later part of our article.

We now come to the appended Syllabus, containing a recital of those "chief errors of our age," which have on earlier occasions been censured by the Holy Father. The principle on which they have been collected, and the method on which they have been arranged, will be readily understood by a few obvious considerations. There has been in these our days a sustained assault, not against this or that particular doctrine, but against the whole body of Catholic dogma as such; not against this or that particular institution, either religious or

civil, but against the whole fabric of Christian society. No errors, we conceive, are included in this Syllabus, which are more partial in their scope than this; none which are not closely bound up with this attempted subversion of Christian dogma and of Christian society. The Pope, however, is often not content with branding these errors simply and nakedly; he more effectually represses them by inculcating in its fullness that particular truth to which they are opposed: and thus it happens that there are various errors here censured, which *taken by themselves* are not of this capital and vital character. An instance will clearly explain our meaning. No tenets as a whole are more profoundly revolutionary than those which subordinate the Church to the State. In order the more successfully to put Catholics on their guard against these detestable errors, the Holy Father draws out a large portion of the Church's positive teaching in an opposite direction. By condemning, *e.g.*, props. xxx., xxxi., and xxxii., he instructs us that various civil immunities, now or formerly enjoyed by ecclesiastics, possess a sanction higher than that of the civil power. Those errors which deny this doctrine, being religious errors, are of course pernicious and dangerous; but they are surely not *in themselves*, as compared with other religious errors, at all violent or extreme. Yet the series of which they form a part, *taken as a whole*, is wildly revolutionary and fundamentally subversive of Christian society; and Pius IX. considers that Catholics will be more effectually warned against the disease in its absolutely fatal form, if they are put thoroughly on their guard even against its milder symptoms.

If the reader carries with him this explanation, a bird's-eye view of the Syllabus will show him, we think, that our account is correct. The errors recited under the three first classes tend without exception to the overthrow, not of this or that particular doctrine, but of all Catholic dogma as such; and all the remaining propositions are attacks, immediate or remote, not on this or that particular institution, but on the whole fabric of Christian society. We will consider then these two groups separately; we will begin with commenting on the three first classes, and we will afterwards proceed to the rest.

Let us first take a most general view of the propositions condemned in the former group, and afterwards examine them in somewhat greater detail. The first proposition denies God altogether. The succeeding eight are inconsistent with the notion of a *revealed* doctrine; *i.e.*, of a message communicating truths, which are above the power of

human reason to discover or to prove, and which must be believed therefore entirely on the word of Him who can neither deceive nor be deceived. Catholic dogma, however, requires for its very existence something more than this; and it involves two theses as the foundation of all: viz. (1), that among existing religions, one and one only is simply true; and (2) that the infallible purity of this one true religion is secured by the everliving authority of the Catholic Church. The latter of these two theses is implicitly denied by props. x.—xiii.; and the former by props. xiv.—xviii. Now, however, to look at these various propositions somewhat more particularly; and we will entreat our readers to refer, as they proceed, to each proposition as it stands, in the original or in the translation.

Prop. i. declares that there is no Personal God; no God distinct from the universe. Prop. ii. says that there is no action of God upon the world, and consequently that He has made no revelation. Props. iii. and iv. teach that we have no knowledge of truth or falsehood, good or evil, except from reason; none, therefore, from revelation. As to prop. v., we find from the Allocution "*Maxima quidem*" to which the Syllabus refers, that those who maintain this proposition understand by "divine revelation" that which is ordinarily esteemed such, but which they regard as a mere product of human reason, and indeed a very imperfect product.* "*That which reason has begun,*" say these miserable men, "*reason should perfect.*" Props. vi. and vii., as will be seen by our note, are found in immediate juxtaposition to prop. v. in the "*Maxima quidem*:" and we need only add that by "divine revelation," in prop. vi., is meant "*men's belief in a divine revelation.*"

From "absolute" we now pass to "moderate Rationalism." Props. viii. and ix. agree with each other as to the foundation on which they rest. "Although," they imply, "God has revealed Christian truth, yet there are no dogmata thus revealed which it is beyond the power of human reason

* "Besides, with the greatest impudence they do not hesitate to assert that divine revelation not only nothing profits, but that it injures, man's perfection; and that the divine revelation itself is imperfect, and therefore subject to a continual and indefinite progress corresponding to the advance of human reason. Nor do they fear to proclaim accordingly that the *prophecies and miracles* recorded and narrated in Scripture are *poetical fictions*, and that the *holy mysteries of our divine faith* are a *result of philosophical investigations*, and that in the sacred books of both Testaments are contained mythical inventions, and (horrible to relate!) that our Lord Jesus Christ Himself is a mythical fiction."

(if duly cultivated) to prove by its own intrinsic strength, when once they have been proposed to it." From this tenet it would follow that philosophy, so far as regards its object-matter, is co-extensive with theology; and Frohschammer so uses the word in props. x. and xi. which are his. These propositions, however, are equally condemnable, whether you take the word "philosophy" in this or in its true sense. Holy Church has been entrusted with the sacred charge of maintaining the faith in its purity. But there is an enormous multitude of philosophical propositions, which lead by necessary result to a denial of Christian doctrine; * and unless, therefore, she could infallibly condemn these errors, she would not have received adequate means for fulfilling her primary trust. Now if she *have* received from God the power of infallibly condemning philosophical propositions, then philosophy (and not only an individual philosopher) is under the obligation of submitting to her authority (prop. x.); nor can the Church always lawfully tolerate those philosophical errors which may lead to false doctrinal conclusions (prop. xi.). A rationalist indeed will object, that since philosophical propositions are wrought out by reason alone, by no other weapons may they be legitimately combated. A writer in the *Tablet* some time ago answered this objection most simply, and at the same time most satisfactorily. A boy brings up his sum to you wrongly cast up; so you rub out what he has written and send him back to try again. Herein you are not interfering with the rights of reason, but on the contrary, requiring the boy to exercise his reason rightfully. If a philosophical proposition is condemned by the Church, the philosopher may know with infallible certainty that it is contrary to reason; and if he will imitate the boy's docility, if he will go back and work out his theorem again carefully, so he will find. At the same time we frankly admit that the Church's mode of dealing with philosophy would be most indefensible and tyrannical, if those strangely-minded Catholics were in the right, who deny her philosophical judgments to be infallible.

As to the two following propositions, it is a sure principle of Catholicism that the "*Ecclesiæ iuge magisterium*," the Church's continuous manuduction, is our infallible guide to doctrinal truth. It directly conflicts with this principle to say (prop. xii.) that her method of action "interferes with the free progress of science:" for this it could not do unless it directly promoted doctrinal error; either the error of supposing that some purely secular question belongs to the domain of

* See DUBLIN REVIEW for July, 1864, pp. 87-8.

religion, or else some error more directly doctrinal. And the infallibility of her practical guidance is no less manifestly denied by the allegation (prop. xiii.) that a theology so expressly and earnestly sanctioned by her as the scholastic "is unsuitable to the necessities of our times and the progress of science." If scholastic theology be not productive of true and important results, it could not so long have received the Church's approval; but if it be productive of such results, it cannot be unsuitable either to this or to any other time.* Lastly, the meaning of prop. xiv., and also its falsehood, are clear, without further comment, from what has been said on props. x. and xi. with which it is intimately connected. It will also be seen that the whole class entitled "moderate rationalism" belongs to that less extreme category of which we spoke above. All the propositions, indeed, contained in it tend to the subversion, not of this or that particular doctrine, but of Catholic dogma as a whole: still they only *tend* to this subversion; they do not in themselves actually subvert it.

The next four propositions are placed in the third class, under the head "Indifferentism, Latitudinarianism." They will occupy us for a much longer space than the preceding, because some preliminary remarks are necessary on the Church's doctrine concerning non-Catholics. On this question, indeed, as elsewhere in this article, our limits compel us rather to be contented with results, than to aim at duly exhibiting the detail of argument; but this circumstance is unavoidable.

The Church teaches, as we need not say that God peremptorily commands, all men to submit to the Catholic Church. All Catholics, however, admit that there may be invincible ignorance of this precept; and they also admit that no one invincibly ignorant of it will be punished precisely for its violation. To say this, however, does not in itself imply, that he who dies a non-Catholic can by possibility obtain salvation: because, firstly, it may be certain that, though he be not guilty of formal heresy, yet he will fall into other mortal sins; and because, secondly, there may be certain positive conditions

* The well-known illiberality of liberals is singularly exemplified in this matter. No good Catholic ever thought of denying the great advantages which sacred science may derive from modern criticism, specially in the departments of Scriptural exegesis and doctrinal history; and the Church has welcomed these new methods with open arms. But nothing will satisfy the liberals, so long as she is content to incorporate what is new, without discarding and condemning what is old. Their aim is not development but revolution.

required for salvation which he is unable to fulfil. Indeed there are two senses in which all Catholics hold that communion with the Church is absolutely necessary to salvation. No one can be saved in the next life, who has not been justified in this;—who is not, at the moment of his death, clothed in habitual grace: but all clothed in habitual grace appertain to the soul of the Church, even though external to her body. Then, further, no adult can be saved without the exercise of divine faith. But divine faith cannot be exercised, except on objects divinely revealed; no adult, therefore, can be saved, except by means of firmly believing certain verities taught by the Church. Up to this point, then, all theologians are in absolute accordance: no one can be saved who, at the moment of death, is external to the soul of the Church; and no adult can be saved except through firm belief in some portions at least of her doctrine.

But there are two controverted questions, which bear most importantly on the hopes of a non-Catholic. Some writers have maintained that belief in the Church's infallibility is a strictly necessary condition of true faith; and if this were once admitted, it would follow, of course, that no single non-Catholic adult could be saved, however invincible his ignorance might be. For ourselves, on the contrary, we entirely concur with Mgr. Manning's statement that "the infallible authority of the Church does not enter of necessity into the act of faith;" though it is "the Divine provision for the perfection and perpetuity of faith, and the ordinary means whereby men are enlightened in the revelation of God." But here a second question comes in. It is absolutely indubitable that certain doctrines must be explicitly believed, in order to salvation; in such sense that no individual can possibly be saved without such belief. Many theologians have included the Trinity and the Incarnation in this list; so that on their view no single Sabellian, Arian, Nestorian, Eutychian, can be saved, however free he may be from formal sin in embracing one of those heresies. But here again our own humble opinion is altogether on the more lenient side. It cannot, indeed, possibly be denied that belief in One God, and in a future state of reward, are strictly necessary (Heb. xi. 6); but then an adult's disbelief in these doctrines cannot be inculpable. And our own opinion is in accordance with the theologians (such as Lugo) who teach that those adults who, with full divine faith, believe these two great doctrines, and who are invincibly ignorant of the rest, may obtain salvation, if they make faithful use of the means at their disposal; especially of frequent and fervent prayer. We

hold, indeed, most firmly, that by so acting they will be brought, flying as it were on eagle's wings, ever nearer to the fulness of light and truth. But their first act of sovereign love or of perfect contrition has invested them with habitual grace; that grace is never lost unless they commit mortal sin; and they will not commit mortal sin, if they are constant in prayer, and if they make such earnest effort, in co-operation with grace, as is abundantly within their power.

Lastly, as to invincible ignorance. Ignorance of Catholicism may be "proximately" or "remotely" vincible. Our own impression is (but we speak with very great diffidence) that in England such ignorance is not very often proximately vincible; or, in other words, that the cases are comparatively rare in which a Protestant has the power of knowing for certain at once, here and now, his duty of submitting to the Church. But we also believe that in a great majority of cases the Protestant's ignorance is remotely, even when not proximately, vincible. We believe that, in a great majority of instances, if he chose to act with reasonable faithfulness on those truths which he now possesses, he would in due time, and that time indeed probably a short one, arrive at the knowledge of Catholicism. Suarez, following S. Augustine, observes, with profound truth, that the two chief causes of heresy are worldliness and pride;* and it is our own grievous fear—so deplorably are Protestants in general trained—that great multitudes of our fellow-countrymen are kept back from Gospel light, through being so miserably immersed in these two interior sins. Now as to those whose ignorance is thus remotely vincible,—how far they are implicated in the precise sin of disobeying God's precept of submission to the Church, we have no room here to inquire: for ourselves, we undoubtedly think that they are. But this at all events is certain—and it is all which practically concerns our purpose—that if they die in such a state they have no hope of salvation. In the first place, we should contend energetically (had we room for entering on the inquiry) that such pride and worldliness are mortal sins of the greatest gravity; and secondly, at all events, these men have no such belief even in the doctrines which they hold, as can, with any colour of reason or plausibility, be called divine faith.

The sum of our statements, however, has been, that on the whole our own humble opinion on the salvability of non-Catholics is among the most hopeful of those which Catholic

* He is speaking directly of heresiarchs; *de Amissâ Innocentiâ*, c. 2, n. 17: but the remark is much more widely applicable.

theology permits. It will bring out emphatically, then, the real character of that most heretical and detestable tenet which is called "indifferentism," if we contrast it, not with the severest, but with the most lenient, doctrine which a Catholic may lawfully hold. We wrote at length in an earlier number on this principle, and on its contradictory, the "dogmatic;"* and here we can but briefly refer to various considerations which will there be found more fully developed. Indifferentism has never been better defined than by Gregory XVI. in the "Mirari Vos." He calls it "that wicked opinion that eternal salvation of the soul can be obtained under any profession of faith, if morals are directed by the rule of virtue:" a statement which in the original is hardly more than a translation into Latin prose of Pope's immortal English poetry:—

"For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight;
His can't be wrong whose life is in the right."†

But one thing must be carefully noted at starting. When Pope talks of a man's "life being in the right," or when the crew of indifferentists speak of his "morals being directed by the rule of virtue," what they mean is, that he abstains from robbery, lying, injustice, outrage; that he performs various acts of public spirit, of generosity, of forbearance, of compassion; that he is (as they are fond of expressing it) a good husband, a good parent, a good friend, a good citizen. As to regular and sustained habits of self-examination, of prayer for forgiveness, of prayer for increased light, of fixing his thoughts constantly on God, of labouring and praying for increased purity of intention,—such exercises as these are no more included in their notion of a man's "life being in the right," than is orthodox belief itself. Ethically speaking, indeed, this error—an error no less monstrous in the eye of reason than revolting in that of faith—is at the very root of their evil system.

Doctrinally speaking, the two principles may be thus con-

* Oct. 1863, art. 6. Some readers may perhaps think that we owe them an apology for our frequent reference to former articles. But the simple fact is that there are several truths which a Catholic reviewer in these days is again and again obliged to enforce. He has absolutely no choice then except either to reprint page after page from earlier numbers, or else to take the more obvious course of referring to those numbers.

† A writer in the *Weekly Register* some time since proposed to meet epigram by epigram; and made some such essay as the following, though we forget his exact words:—

"All holy lives to the true faith belong;
His can't be right whose creed is in the wrong."

trusted in detail. The good Catholic holds that God has directly revealed a large and most definite assemblage of doctrines: the indifferentist, that He has placed in man's hands the Bible and other data,* and wishes each man to judge for himself, by reasoning from those data, what religious opinions he shall take up. The good Catholic holds that so far as any man, even without fault of his own, is unimbued with any part of these revealed doctrines—and much more, so far as he has embraced any opinions inconsistent with them—he suffers a most serious calamity: the indifferentist holds, on the contrary, that one set of religious opinions is congenial to A.'s temperament, and another to B.'s; insomuch that A.'s moral character would suffer by taking up B.'s opinions, and B.'s by taking up A.'s. The good Catholic holds that God enjoins unity of doctrine, and that He draws towards the one truth all who earnestly supplicate, under due conditions, for light and grace: the indifferentist argues that God intended men's difference of religious opinion, and delights in it. The good Catholic holds that possession and contemplation of religious truth generates a peculiar and most elevated moral and devotional atmosphere; and he shrinks therefore sensitively from friendship and familiar intercourse with Protestants, lest the purity of that atmosphere be tainted: but the indifferentist rejoices in surrounding himself with men of every various opinion, that "prejudices" may be rubbed off. The good Catholic abhors, as a kind of plague, any educational system which may bring his sons into contact with misbelievers: but to the indifferentist such an arrangement is an integral part of his ideal. The good Catholic holds that whoever has not full ground for certainty that he possesses religious truth, should seek it earnestly and keenly as the most precious of treasures: the indifferentist holds that nothing more is required or wished by God, than for each man truly to profess what he sincerely thinks. The good Catholic holds that such ascetical exercises as we lately mentioned are most clearly approved by reason, and are the one appointed way towards revealed truth: the indifferentist responds, that they do but narrow and weaken the mind, and that he who is fool enough to practise them may as well turn papist at once.

It will be seen from this sketch that no particular heresy—Pelagian, Lutheran, Unitarian—can be compared with this as

* Indifferentists widely differ from each other in the position which they assign to the Bible: some regard it as the chief and even sole datum given by God, while others make no account of it at all. But we have no room here to consider these details.

to the deadliness of its results. They assail particular doctrines, but this assails the common principle of all doctrine. And it is evident that so devastating a pestilence affords an abundantly sufficient object for the Holy Father's horror, without supposing that he intends incidentally to censure any opinion, which has hitherto been freely held among Catholic theologians. This anticipation will be altogether confirmed by a study of the Papal decrees in question; nor indeed is it too much to say that these decrees will be found greatly to favour the more lenient, among those Catholic opinions which have been hitherto approved, as to the salvability of those external to the Church's body. We will commence, then, in due course, with prop. xv., and quote the entire passage which censures that proposition. It occurs in the condemnation of a certain Spanish book, on June 10th, 1851; and it runs as follows:—

The author, although a Catholic, and, as is reported, a priest, in order that he may more securely and with impunity follow out that *indifferentism* and rationalism with which he shows himself infected, denies that the Church has power of dogmatically defining that *the religion of the Catholic Church is exclusively the true religion*, and teaches that it is free for every man to embrace and profess that religion which, judged by the light of reason, he may have thought true. He attacks the law of celibacy, &c., &c.

This, then, is the tenet which Pius IX. here condemns as *indifferentism*: a denial that Catholicism is exclusively the true religion, and a consequent affirmation that every man may freely choose whatever religion his reason prefers. The context alone, then, interprets the condemnation. Yet even apart from the context, its meaning is surely clear. Let us suppose some moralists to maintain that "it is free for every man to fight a duel under those circumstances in which he judges that reason would sanction it." Every one would understand them to mean that there is no divine precept against duelling; and not merely that a man may be invincibly ignorant of that precept. Just so this censured proposition obviously means that there is no divine precept against embracing any religion other than the Catholic; it cannot be understood merely to state that a man may be invincibly ignorant of such precept. It is the former thesis, then, which is censured, and not the latter.

To prop. xvi., also, we will give its one legitimate illustration, by quoting the entire passage which condemned it:—

To this appertains that shocking system, extremely repugnant to the natural light of reason itself, concerning the indifference of any particular religion (*de cuiuslibet religionis indifferentiâ*), whereby these sophists, re-

moving all distinction between virtue and vice, between truth and error, between goodness and turpitude, pretend that they can obtain eternal salvation in the practice (cultu) of any religion : just as though there could ever be any participation of justice with iniquity, or any fellowship of light with darkness, or any agreement of Christ with Belial.

Now the character of a man's worship absolutely depends on the character of his belief. Since, therefore, as we have already pointed out, no one can advance towards Heaven except by exercising faith in a greater or less portion of Catholic doctrine, neither can he advance thither except by practising at least some integral portion of Catholic worship. But the misbelievers here denounced profess that the Hindoo can gain salvation by offering human victims and practising foul impurities, no less than the Catholic by fasting and prayer ; "as though," well may the Pope add, "there could be any participation of justice with iniquity, or any fellowship of light with darkness, or any agreement of Christ with Belial." So much, then, on prop. xvi. : prop. xviii. needs no comment whatever, and prop. xvii. alone remains. The two Papal pronouncements, to which the Syllabus refers us on this proposition, are so momentous, that we will quote them at length ; beginning with the later, which is the clearer and more explicit of the two. We will put into italics the more important sentences in either direction.

And here, our beloved sons and Venerable Brethren, we must again mention and condemn that most grievous error in which some Catholics are unhappily plunged, who think that *men living in errors and external to the true faith and Catholic unity can arrive at eternal life*. Which, indeed, is opposed in the greatest degree to Catholic doctrine. *It is known, indeed, to us and to you, that those who labour under invincible ignorance concerning our most holy religion, and who lead a virtuous and correct life, sedulously keeping the natural law and its precepts engraven by God on the hearts of all, and prepared to obey God—[that these men] are able, through the operation of Divine light and grace, to obtain eternal life ;* since God, Who clearly sees, searches, and knows the minds, dispositions, thoughts, and habits of all men, according to His supreme goodness and mercy, does not suffer that any one should suffer eternal punishment who has not on him the guilt of voluntary fault. *But the Catholic dogma is also most notorious, namely, that no one can be saved outside of the Catholic Church, and that those men who are contumacious against the authority and definitions of the same Church, and who are pertinaciously divided from the unity of the Church herself and from Peter's successor the Roman Pontiff to whom the custody of the vineyard has been entrusted by the Saviour—[that such men] cannot obtain eternal salvation.* For the words are most clear of Christ the Lord, "If he hear not the Church, let him be to thee as a heathen and publican." "He that heareth you heareth Me, and he that despiseth you despiseth Me ; but he

that despiseth Me despiseth Him that sent Me." "He that believeth not shall be condemned." "He that believeth not is already judged." "He that is not with Me is against Me, and he that gathereth not with Me scattereth." Hence the Apostle Paul calls such men perverted and condemned by their own judgment: and the chief of the Apostles calls them lying teachers, who introduce sects of perdition, and deny the Lord, bringing on themselves swift destruction.

But God forbid that the children of the Catholic Church should ever be in any manner enemies to those who are not joined with us in the same bonds of faith and charity; but rather let them ever study to pursue and assist them with all the offices of Christian charity when they are poor, or sick, or afflicted with any other calamities; and chiefly let [the children of the Church] strive to snatch [these men] from the darkness of error in which they unhappily lie, and bring them back to their most tender mother, the Church, who never ceases lovingly to stretch forth her maternal hands to them and call them back to her bosom; that, being rooted in faith, hope, and charity, and [remaining] firm, and bearing fruit in every good work, they may attain eternal salvation.

The second of the italicized passages seems to us absolutely conclusive of the fact, that Pius IX. does not teach the Church's exclusive privileges in any such sense as to deny the salvability of individual non-Catholics. The condition assigned by him for such salvability is threefold: (1.) That their ignorance of Catholicism is invincible. (2.) That they sedulously keep the natural law and its precepts engraven by God on the hearts of all. (3.) That they are prepared to obey God; or, in other words, that they are prepared to embrace the truth so soon as they may have means of knowing it. And it will be further observed that he speaks of all this as the one recognized and established doctrine: "it is well known," he says, "both to us and you." It is not, then, any private theory of our own, but simply our docility to the Holy Father, which compels us to understand his other statements in a sense consistent with this. Nor is it difficult to do so. He says that men cannot be saved who are living in errors: but these men are living in and by the light of God's natural law; while those errors which they have speculatively admitted, exercise little or no positive influence on their interior "life." He says that those cannot be saved who are aliens from the true Faith: but these men hold the Catholic doctrine on God's Existence and on a large amount of moral truth, while they are fully prepared, in the event of due information, to embrace the whole Faith. He says that those cannot be saved who are aliens from Catholic unity: but these men belong to the soul of the Church. Lastly, passing to the third italicized sentence, he denies the salvability of those who are

contumacious against the Church's authority and *pertinaciously* divided from her unity: which cannot, of course, be truly said concerning men who are invincibly ignorant of her Divine authority.

Before leaving, however, this present determination, two further particulars should be noticed. Firstly, there is a certain superficial difficulty in understanding how it harmonizes with the Catholic truth, that the exercise of faith is indispensably necessary to an adult's salvation. It can, however, be easily reconciled with that doctrine, by understanding the Pope to mean that those who persevere, through Divine grace, in faithfully fulfilling the natural law so far as they know it, will be infallibly brought by the same grace to faith; and if they continue to act diligently on light received, will be brought by grace through faith to justification, and through justification to salvation.

Secondly, this declaration gives great sanction to Mgr. Manning's opinion, "that the operations of the Holy Spirit have been from the beginning of the world co-extensive with the whole human race."* For certainly its more obvious sense implies that those who labour to fulfil the natural law are from the first visited with supernatural light and grace.

We will next quote the earlier declaration: which has, indeed, the more express authority in the matter, as containing in words the precise censure repeated in the Syllabus:—

We know, not without grief, that another and no less deadly error has occupied some parts of the Catholic world, and has seated itself in the minds of many Catholics, who think that *good hopes should be entertained concerning the eternal salvation of all those who in no respect (nequaquam) live (versantur) in the true Church of Christ*. They are often, therefore, accustomed to inquire what will after death be the lot and condition of those who have not been united (*addicti*) to the Catholic faith; and, adducing the emptiest reasons, they give an answer which may support this evil opinion. *God forbid, Venerable Brethren, that we should dare to limit the Divine mercy, which is infinite! God forbid that we should wish to scrutinize God's hidden counsels and judgments, which are a vast abyss, and which cannot be penetrated by human thought! But, according to the duty of our Apostolic office, we would have your Episcopal solicitude and watchfulness aroused, in order that, as far as you can strive, you would expel from men's minds that opinion equally impious and fatal, that in every religion can be found the way of eternal salvation*. With your excellent ability and learning show to the peoples placed under your charge that the dogmata of the Catholic faith are in no respect opposed to the Divine mercy and justice. *For it is to be held as of faith that externally to the Apostolic*

* Letter to Dr. Pusey, p. 7.

Roman Church no one can be saved, that this is the one ark of salvation, that he who enters not this will perish in the flood; but yet it is equally to be accounted as certain that those who labour under ignorance of the true religion, if that ignorance be invincible, are implicated in no sin for this before the eyes of God. Now, truly, who would arrogate to himself so much as that he can mark out the limits of such ignorance according to the variety of peoples, regions, understandings, and other things so many? For when, freed from the chain of this body, we shall see God as He is, we shall understand in how close and beautiful a bond the Divine mercy and justice are united: but as long as we live upon earth, weighed down with this mortal frame which dulls the soul, let us hold most firmly, according to Catholic doctrine, that there is one God, one faith, one Baptism; to go forward by inquiring further is forbidden. But, as charity demands, let us pour forth constant prayer that all the nations everywhere may be converted to Christ, and let us labour according to our strength for the common salvation of mankind; for the Lord's hand has not been shortened, and the gifts of Heavenly Grace will in no respect be wanting to those who sincerely wish and pray to be refreshed with its light. Truths of this kind should be fixed most deeply in the minds of the faithful, that they may be freed from possibility of being corrupted by false doctrines, tending to cherish that religious indifference which we see ever growing more widely and receiving greater strength to the destruction of souls.

The doctrine of this Allocution is evidently, as far as it goes, in complete harmony with that of the later Encyclical already considered. The Pope's teaching is this:—It is certain, as a matter of doctrine, that a man who is really in invincible ignorance of Catholicism will not be punished for disbelieving it [says the Allocution], and may obtain eternal salvation [adds the Encyclical]. Nor, again, can any one on earth "mark out the limits of such ignorance," or say how widely it may or may not extend. This doctrine is certainly not inconsistent with the Catholic dogma, that the Church is the one ark of salvation, and that all who die externally to her will perish eternally. But fully granting all this, yet to say (with the proposition before us) that good hopes should be entertained in the salvation of all those external to the visible Church, is really to say that all such men are invincibly ignorant of her claims; are "wishing and praying to be refreshed with the light of divine grace;" are prepared to embrace the truth so soon as they have means of knowing it; and are living in conformity with the Natural Law. A more outrageous and extravagant assertion cannot be imagined.

It is, of course, impossible that any Catholic can formally profess the tenet of indifferentism—the tenet, namely, that no religion has been revealed by God as exclusively the true one.

But very many educated Catholics, alas ! both here and abroad, as the Pope most truly says, have imbibed deep draughts of this fatal poison. The proportion of educated Catholics is, indeed, by no means small, who, so far from abhorring mixed education, approve and support it. Such men carry the doctrine of invincible ignorance into an exaggeration truly portentous. Consider, *e. g.* the great mass of English gentlemen : immersed as they are in worldliness, ambition, money-getting, pleasure-seeking ; and haters of the Church and her Saints, mainly because of her protest against these habits of life : there is many a Catholic, incredible as it may appear, who takes for granted that these men's ignorance is invincible, and that (in their present state of mind) they have a real hope and prospect of Heaven. Few things are nearer to the heart of the Church's faithful children, than that such terrible scandals should be expelled from among us.

The propositions hitherto considered tend, as we have more than once said, to overthrow not some particular doctrine, but Catholic dogma in its integrity : and in like manner the remainder assault, not this or that religious or civil institution, but the whole fabric of Christian society. In order here to explain our meaning, we must necessarily solicit the reader's attention to a short course of introductory remark.

There is a not inconsiderable portion of Catholic Truth, which bears directly and immediately on civil government and social progress. Many doctrines comprised in it may, from the unhappy condition of affairs in a particular time or place, have for the moment little or no practical effect ; but so far as circumstances permit them to produce their natural results, they exercise a most deeply-reaching and widely-extending influence on the whole of society. Such doctrines as the following are included in this number :—(1.) Christian marriage is strictly indissoluble ; and any union with the other sex which is not marriage is among the gravest of sins. (2.) The marriage of Christians is a sacrament ; and all questions, therefore, which concern it appertain exclusively and peremptorily to the Church. (3.) The right of parents to the government and education of their children comes immediately from God, while it is the Church's function to declare authoritatively its nature and limits. (4.) As it is the Church's office to inform and direct the conscience of individuals, so also of nations in their corporate capacity. (5.) The Church is her children's infallible guide in the spiritual and moral order : therefore, so far as regards the events of life or the usages of society in their moral aspect, the one true attitude of public opinion is that

of humble submission to the Church's judgment. Great service may undoubtedly be done if private individuals, competent to the task, discuss such questions before the Church has decided them; but such discussion must proceed in undeviating subjection to her supreme authority. (6.) The civil governor wields an authority which comes immediately from God;* he is not the citizens' delegate, but their divinely authorized superior. (7.) Consequently, the mere fact of their being, to any imaginable extent, dissatisfied with his government, does not in itself at all dispense with their obligation of obedience. (8.) The Church, however, possesses a large power of intervention, so far as his measures violate morality or injuriously affect the nation's highest interest. (9.) The distinction between rich and poor has been made by God himself, being involved in the unalterable facts of human society. The vast majority of men must of necessity labour for subsistence or for material comfort: the few being exempted from this burden, that they may benefit the community, on the one hand by their religious ministries, their prayers, and their austerities; or, on the other hand, by their intellectual cultivation and activity. (10.) The civil ruler is commissioned by God, not merely to aim at temporal good, but predominantly at spiritual and supernatural. (11.) Since, therefore, as regards the moral aspect of secular things, the one legitimate attitude of public opinion is that of submission to the Church's voice,—in a healthy state of society the civil governor will earnestly co-operate with the Church in exercising a due censorship over publications, and in restraining the expression of public opinion within its legitimate channels. We do not, however, contravene this truth by admitting that deplorable circumstances may exist—indeed, now exist throughout a very large portion of Christendom,—under which no such attempt can be made without doing far more harm than good. (12.) The civil governor has received from God a power of punishing his subjects, not merely for disturbing the public peace, but for violating the Church's commands; a power, however, which he can only legitimately exercise under the Church's supervision. (13.) In a nation therefore which enjoys the priceless blessing of Catholic unity, he should repress by force every attempt to introduce the public profession of heresy or infidelity.†

* This is not at all denied by the school of Suarez and Bellarmine. See pp. 299, 300, of our present number.

† All these theses are unquestionably integral parts of Catholic truth; but we have already said that, in consequence of the many subjects on which we

Now no one will doubt that these doctrines cohere with each other admirably in theory ; nor again can it be denied that for several centuries they formed the acknowledged basis of practical action : the objection raised against their vindication always is, that they are violently out of harmony with modern society. We reply confidently, that any imaginable assemblage of principles is out of harmony with modern society, for that the latter proceeds on no consistent principle at all ; those liberal maxims, which are commonly alleged as its principles, most inadequately and untruly expressing its real habits of thought and action. Men continually forget that modern society is not a new creation out of chaos—as the mediæval organization may not untruly be called—but on the contrary, is the creature and lineal descendant of that very organization. No doubt he who takes his stand on those Catholic doctrines which we have just enunciated, will, at the first glance, be tempted to regard modern Europe as almost in a state of political decrepitude. But we believe this view to be altogether superficial : even in France or Germany, and much more in England, there is a far greater amount than appears on the surface, of traditional usage and traditional habits of thought in the social and political order, which has come down from the ages of faith. Current maxims, we repeat, are most untrue exponents of a nation's mind. Take one instance out of a hundred. No phrase is heard more frequently from every Englishman's mouth than "liberty of conscience ;" and if you ask him to explain its meaning, he will reply that the expression of conscientious convictions can never be a fit matter for penalties. But let us suppose a dangerous assault to be really made against some portion of the fundamental basis on which English institutions rest. Let us suppose, *e.g.*,—not that a few isolated thinkers who are secure because they are harmless,—but that a large and influential sect should arise, instituting an active propaganda in behalf of various imaginable tenets : of the tenet, *e.g.*, that "property is theft ;" or that there is no obligation in conscience to obey the law of the land ; or that polygamy is both lawful and desirable. Any Englishman might fully recognize in these fanatics a perfect sincerity of conviction ; but he would only think the worse of them in consequence. And at all events they would assuredly be prevented by the strong hand of the law from proselytizing, or from otherwise poisoning the national mind. The heart of

must touch in this article, we have to take our doctrines for granted without attempting to prove them. On a future occasion we may draw out some part of the Church's authoritative teaching on these matters.

Englishmen is far sounder at bottom than would be guessed from what we must call their fluency in the slang of liberalism.

Such then seems to us the political and social world as it now exists: it is in a false and self-contradictory position, while two violently conflicting principles are struggling within it for mastery. So far as society is still based on Catholic principles, we may justly call it "Christian society." Moreover, since these principles constitute its one conservative element, their contradictories obtain legitimately the name "revolutionary," even though unhappily they may be to some extent incorporated in political institutions. Of late years an attempt has been made, though not very successfully, to express methodically these revolutionary tenets; and we find accordingly some such formulæ as the following: (1.) "Civil government should proceed quite irrespectively of religious truth; in its official acts it should treat such truth as non-existent." (2.) "Its one legitimate end is the preservation of exterior peace; the protection of person and property." (3.) "The citizens hire their government, just as the inhabitants of a street might hire a body of police, to look after their exterior peace." (4.) "Consequently they may discharge such government whenever they please." (5.) "Public opinion should be the one authoritative rule of society; society as such may recognize no other." (6.) "The press, as the organ of public opinion, should be absolutely free." (7.) "The rising generation must be trained up in accordance with the nation's received maxims; and the nation has a right therefore to prescribe education at its will." (8.) "The existing laws of marriage and of property are unjust and oppressive." Such maxims as these are often expressed with a great show and boast of philosophical profundity; but neither do they agree with each other, nor do they furnish at all a true analysis of those principles which really actuate the revolutionary party. Thus revolutionists often say that the ruler should aim only at the promotion of exterior peace; whereas they practically count it among his highest functions to uphold and increase a nation's "independence and glory." Then in attacking the Church's judgment against liberty of the press, they profess a warm desire that every phase of opinion be duly represented and advocated; but, in fact (as is shown by their educational tyranny and a thousand other signs), they labour to suppress absolutely and entirely every way of thinking except their own.* Then, again, that idolized "people," "the only source of

* A method of course most reasonable in the case of an infallible Church, as regards those matters to which her infallibility extends.

legitimate power"—what is it? Do they mean to express by this term the mere numerical majority? On the contrary, wherever the masses are on the whole orderly and devout, your true revolutionist despises them as ignorant, superstitious, and (if so be) priest-ridden.* Still less does he express by the term "people" the saintly or the highly educated few. The best account we can give of his mind is, that "the people" means with him the aggregate of shallow public writers, and of restless busybodies, and of those generally who have received a certain smattering of what he absurdly calls education.

This impossibility of reconciling revolutionary tenets with each other, need not surprise us; for such is the universal characteristic of error. From forgetfulness, indeed, of this circumstance, a certain unreality has been imputed to our Holy Father's language on various occasions: in one breath, *e.g.*, he denounces these men for representing the civil governor as a mere delegate of the people, and in the next for vindicating to him an unlimited and universal despotism. The inconsistency is with them, not with him. Yet, at last, there is a real harmony of principle pervading all these contradictory tenets, and a real congeniality of mind in those to whom such tenets are dear. The true social theory proceeds throughout on the supremacy of what is divine over what is human; revolutionism in its every manifestation exalts what is human against what is divine. And this statement will be better understood, if we attempt to sketch what may be called the natural history of a revolutionist.

In these days of newspapers and cheap literature, there are very many men who possess a superficial acquaintance with political facts; though the number is probably smaller than ever of those who patiently and accurately study them. A large proportion of the former class have no reverence whatever either for religion or for the majesty of human law; while, on the other hand, their alienation from God does not take the form of simple recklessness or sensuality (though they are often consummate in this latter particular also) but of pride and worldliness. Personal or national greatness; glory; freedom from restraint; these are the objects of their mad and wicked idolatry. Such is your model revolutionist.

* The revolutionary press unanimously admitted that the numerical majority of Poles was adverse to the recent insurrection; yet none the less they delighted in representing it as a noble movement of the Polish "people." Lest we be misunderstood, we should add that we hate as cordially as any can hate the atrocious tyranny of Russia; though we do not recognize armed resistance as its appropriate remedy.

His pride abhors the idea of control and responsibility: since therefore he devotes himself to politics, he begins by avowing that the political order is wholly external to the religious; that it should ignore God's revelation, and, indeed, God Himself. Is he poor? He snarls at the institution of property, and erects his disgust into a political system. Is he possessed of but little political influence under the present *régime*? He maintains the great principle that all government springs from the people, and (as one of the people) organizes disaffection and sedition. Is his country under the rule of some foreign nation? His pride takes the alarm, for he regards his own exaltation as bound up with his country's: his thoughts rest, not on the spiritual and the physical evils which may probably accrue to his countrymen from their position; but on what he un-Christianly denominates "the ignominy of subjection to a foreign yoke." On the other hand, let this same man be himself elevated to political power, every one may anticipate his career. He will be intolerant on differences of opinion; and he will claim for that power which he himself wields, an absolute supremacy, alike over the public opinion of adults and over the education of youth. His tendency to rebellion has now but one authority on earth against which it can vent itself: that authority therefore he will hate with a deadly hatred, and will indignantly deny its possession of any right to control or censure his conduct. We refer, of course, to the Catholic Church and the Vicar of Christ.

Now let us not be understood as maintaining that no men advocate revolutionary tenets except those formed after this model. We know well enough that well-intentioned visionaries have before this, from philanthropic motives, advocated communism; that there have been zealous Catholics who claim for each citizen as his intrinsic right the civil liberty of professing and propagating a false religion; nay, that the very cornerstone of revolutionism, the fundamental and gigantic impiety which we call political atheism, the exclusion of God's revelation from all authority over society as such,—that even this has found apparent advocates among loyal children of the Church. But we do say that all these tenets involve in fact an exaltation of the human against the divine, and that they are the legitimate property of those proud and rebellious men whom we have described.

And now as to the future. In our own country there is undoubtedly, thank God, every appearance of political stability; but on the Continent all observed phenomena appear to indicate that the present constitution of society is temporary and

transitional.* As yet the revolutionists naturally put forth their chief attacks, rather against existing institutions than against Catholicism pure and simple; but in proportion as the present framework of government is weakened and tends to dissolution, a hand-to-hand and internecine civil conflict must result, between the Catholic and revolutionary principles as such. What then is the work of zealous Catholics before the conflict actually arises? Of course to prepare themselves for the day of battle, to repair their armour, and have it at hand ready for use. In other words, it behoves them to acquaint themselves familiarly with the full body of Catholic doctrine, so far as it bears on social questions; to teach their children this doctrine; to diffuse it by every legitimate method; to argue in its behalf from philosophy, from history, from reason; to show all those who profess the Catholic name how peremptorily the Church teaches it; in one word, to meet the revolutionary propaganda by a propaganda of truth. But here it is that we encounter one keenest grief of our time. That there should be a number of worldly and tepid Catholics, who choose to reject a large and important portion of the Church's infallible teaching, because it is not embodied in actual definitions of faith, and because it clashes with their whole evil habits of thought,—all this was to be expected; it happens in every age, and will happen to the end of the world. But it is a piercing sorrow to think that at this period men who are among the Church's most zealous and disinterested defenders have been (most unintentionally, but most certainly) unfaithful to her teaching. She has not merely condemned the modern "liberties" from their first appearance;† she taught the contradictory truth

* M. Guizot calls it "*the terrible problem of our time*" "to discover what is that new political edifice which is suitable to the new society, and how to construct it so that it may endure."—(Church and Christian Societies, p. 28.) He considers, then, that as yet there is no durable political edifice in harmony with modern principles.

† These liberties were solemnly proclaimed in '89. So early as March 29th, 1790, Pius VI. delivered an Allocution, in which he denounces the "liberty" just asserted, "of thinking concerning religion as each man may please, and with impunity publishing his thoughts;" and also that of "being bound by no laws except those to which he himself consents." He teaches, in opposition to the new principles, that "the welfare of kingdoms rests chiefly on the doctrine of Christ," and that it is "the office of kings to defend the Church's cause and rights." On March 10th, 1791, he proceeds to denounce the "monstrous" tenet that "man living in society should not be troubled about religion, and that he should be at liberty to think, speak, write, and publish whatever he pleases on the subject of religion." And on April 23rd of the same year, he denounces expressly "*those seventeen articles*" of '89, as "ascribing to man rights adverse to society and religion." The last quotation we give on the authority of Abbé Morel (*Les Catholiques libéraux*, p. 118).

This condemnation of the principles of '89 is as far as possible from leading

long before they were heard of. The tenets advocated by these admirable men, on liberty of conscience and liberty of the press, are simply anti-Catholic; and if (which God forbid!) such a state of things continued to exist when the day of deadly combat should arrive, there would arise the scandal and the calamity of conscientious and zealous Catholics throwing no small portion of their weight into the wrong scale.

Here, as we venture to surmise, is in part the significance of this Encyclical, in so far as it vindicates various prerogatives of the Church which have long been generally dormant, or in so far as it stigmatizes various modern errors which have very largely influenced legislation and administration. The Pope's primary object, indeed, in its promulgation was (no doubt) to fulfil the commission which he has divinely received, of maintaining doctrinal purity: for many of the errors condemned deny truths immediately revealed by God, and all the rest tend inevitably to such denial. But there is an important social end also to be attained.* No one can say how soon the time may arrive in large portions of Europe, when the argumentative issue will be between Catholicism as a whole, and the revolution as a whole. The Holy Father is, therefore, reasonably anxious that loyal Catholics shall be trained, not to defend this or that particular institution against this or that particular assault, but to support the old body of Catholic truth in its full integrity, against the new mass of revolutionary error. It may be added that various Catholic doctrines appear to great disadvantage if considered separately from the rest. One instance here will be a sample of many. Considering the great tendency of civil rulers to selfishness and oppression, the doctrine of non-resistance may well appear to give society inadequate protection against such evils, unless you take also into account "that salutary influence" spoken of in the Encyclical "which the Catholic Church, according to the institution and command of her Divine Author, should freely exercise to the end of the world over nations and their rulers." But if thinkers would but suppose the Church permitted freely to exercise these

to the consequence that a Catholic's obedience is not strictly due to the constitution of his country, even though the latter is in some degree founded on this unsound basis. We refer to this very important question in two of our short notices.

* The Cardinal Vicar of Rome, in his "sacred invitation" (see note to p. 449) says that the Sovereign Pontiff "was sensibly moved at the sight of those evils which menace human society," and at the prevalent "spirit of error" which threatens to bring back "that barbarism from which society was rescued by the light of the Gospel."

her divinely given prerogatives, they might learn to see that no more perfect security could well be imagined against tyranny and despotism. It is of vital moment then, we repeat, that the social doctrines of Catholicism be mastered in their full consistency and harmony, and not merely apprehended in detached fragments. Thus, and thus only, will the Church's children be enabled to fight, when the day of battle arrives, clothed in her full and impenetrable armour. Thus, and thus only, will their success bear any kind of proportion to their zeal. That by such means indeed they will be able indefinitely to withstand and retard the triumphs of revolutionism, is abundantly clear: whether a resistance can be put forth which shall be fully effectual, insomuch that a reaction may set in towards better and higher principles—this is an issue which is in God's hands alone, and on which it would be absurd to speculate. Only let Catholics do their part: when the crisis arises, let it find them at their post; well acquainted with their doctrine, loudly professing it, and prepared to act or suffer in its behalf. Thus they will have fashioned themselves to be their Creator's serviceable instruments, of which He may make such use as to Him seems good.

Now the present Encyclical, it may well be hoped, will tend powerfully to this consummation; it will tend to bring about far greater unity among Catholics on these politico-religious controversies than has hitherto prevailed. There is, thank God, a very large number of the Church's children, who have no other wish than to embrace the whole of her doctrine, so soon as they are aware that it possesses her sanction; but who (from circumstances of the time) are most imperfectly acquainted with its real extent. These men will not only be taught by this Papal utterance very many Catholic truths which they had not hitherto known as possessing that character, but they will also be set by it on a course of inquiry, which must still further enlarge their acquaintance with the Church's most consistent and profound teaching on these questions. And even those who have been hitherto greatly prepossessed, (that we may not say violently prejudiced,) in favour of '89 and its "liberties," cannot (we think) but derive great benefit from this solemn pronouncement. The very lowest view taken by any Catholic of such declarations, involves the obligation of abstaining from all public opposition to them; and the silencing of error is no unimportant step towards the prevalence of truth. Then, further, such good men as these "liberal Catholics" cannot but be so far impressed with the Pope's earnest and authoritative language, as to reconsider their position; to study more carefully than they have hitherto

done the Church's various and decisive declarations on the side opposed to theirs ; and the authoritative lessons also contained in the facts of her history. Finally, the very frequency of such declarations must lead them, we would hope, carefully to inquire what authority appertains to that whole class, of which the Encyclical now before us is so prominent a representative. If they will only candidly and carefully examine this question, we have no doubt of the conclusion at which they must ultimately arrive. They must agree with us that such instructions are an integral part of the Church's infallible teaching.

But a very different notion of the Pope's purpose seems to exist among many Protestants both here and abroad. They seem to fancy that he has put forth this Encyclical as an act of deliberate opposition to constituted governments ; as a preparation, or at least as a "feeler," for an agitation on behalf of some organic change in a Catholic direction. Now we have of course no data on which to form a judgment, except those which are open to the whole world ; but we are quite confident that there is no vestige or shadow of foundation for such an idea. We speak altogether under correction : but we believe there could be no greater mistake in any part of Europe than a Catholic agitation in behalf of organic change ; however greatly desirable in itself such change might be. The true way of promoting God's cause, is to cultivate in ourselves and to spread abroad a reverence for the supernatural, a love of souls, a devotion to the Church, a chivalrous and enthusiastic loyalty to the Holy Father, a lively and practical adhesion to the whole body of truth which he teaches. Organic changes, which are in the abstract greatly for the better, are, nevertheless, real calamities when not supported by general conviction ; while on the other hand a sound and healthy public opinion, if it be once formed and consolidated, is sure sooner or later to secure them, and that in the most legitimate and spontaneous way. The generating a sound and healthy public opinion—this seems to us, we repeat, the proximate end of a genuine Catholic politician or public writer ; as we believe it to be the Holy Father's end in his recent utterance.

At all events, that his maxims and intentions are most opposite to those which Protestants impute, seems to us most manifest. What single instance can be named in which he has exhorted his children to aim at any organic change whatever ? The only action which can possibly be called political, to which he has summoned the general body of Catholics, has been, not the promotion of organic change, but resistance against the most violent organic changes which can

well be imagined; against the overthrow of his civil principedom, and, again, against the attempted realization of socialistic and communistic dreams. In particular instances, certainly, he has protested against liberty of worships; but these have quite invariably been cases in which such liberty itself, and not its withdrawal, was the organic change. The key-note which he sounded in his first Encyclical has, in fact, been in completest harmony with his whole subsequent reign. In that Allocution, after denouncing with characteristic vigour the revolutionary machinations of the time, he thus draws his practical conclusion:—

For which reason never cease to preach the Gospel, in order that the Christian people, being daily more instructed in the most holy commands of the Christian law, may increase in knowledge of God, may avoid evil and do good, and walk in the Lord's ways. . . . With all your strength, Venerable Brethren, labour to achieve this, that the faithful may pursue charity, seek after peace, and sedulously do those things which belong to charity and peace; in order that dissensions, hatred, envyings, enmities, being absolutely extinguished, all men may love each other with mutual charity, and be perfect in the same sense and the same judgment, and unanimously think, say, and savour of the same thing in our Lord Jesus Christ. Labour to inculcate on the Christian people due obedience and subjection to princes and authorities, &c., &c.

Such are the arms prescribed by Pius IX. for encountering the revolutionary host. Protestant newspapers have been energetic in drawing attention to those portions of his teaching which the public was sure violently to misinterpret. Why have they been silent on such Christian and edifying counsels as these?

But there is far more recent evidence of the Holy Father's true mind in the letter written by his command to M. de Beaulieu at the very time when this Encyclical and Syllabus must have been in active preparation. It runs as follows:—

Most Illustrious Sir,

Although most weighty cares concerning the whole Church allow no leisure for reading to our Most Holy Lord, Pius IX., yet he could not but cast his eyes on the book you sent him, and skim, at least, over some portion of its contents. For he thought that you had undertaken most opportunely to detect and refute an error which has long since been deeply implanted in the minds of many of the faithful; viz., their thinking that the present evils of human society are attributable to the depravity or ignorance of men, rather than to the fault of those principles which are accepted at this day; and of supposing that order and peace are to be restored at length, if all men, and the Church herself, favouring the age's progress, embrace and assert the boasted liberties. But, from that small part of your book which he has been able rather to glance at than to read, he has observed, not without pleasure,

that it excellently corresponds to the title prefixed, and shows that all the efforts of those who so think tend to this result, although against their will, *that there be only introduced the freedom of error and the Church's consequent oppression.* And, chiefly, it pleased him that, in order to repel error, you had derived your arms from the very Chair of truth, and had called to mind those things which Gregory XVI., of sacred memory, had taught on this subject; and which, *if they had been received as they should have been, would have removed all dissension and reason for doubting.* But some men think that humble submission should indeed be rendered to documents of the Holy See when they treat of religion, of discipline, of morals; but not equally when the question concerns the civil government of society: [and these men, therefore,] have chosen rather to follow their own bent [*proprio ingenio*], [than to accept the decision of the Holy See]; as though such government were not subject to the laws of virtue and to the teaching of morals; and as though *the best method of governing peoples were not delivered in Scripture, of which the Church is interpreter.* Would that your work may accomplish what it has not been hitherto possible fully to achieve, and that they may see themselves to be in the wrong *when they proclaim those things as in themselves approvable and useful,* and contend for them as ends to be advanced, which the condition of events and force of circumstances recommend as endurable *for the avoidance of more grievous evils.* Let them understand that, if the rights of truth and error be placed on a level, *it must necessarily happen, from men's innate proclivity [to evil], that the latter will grow strong and the former be oppressed.* Let them weigh those pernicious consequences of their doctrine, from which their pious mind recoils; and which, although dissembled or reprobated by them, by pressure of logical force can in no way be prevented. Lastly, let them advert to the detriment inflicted by them on the Church's cause, which, being on every side assailed with so great violence and [such dangerous] machinations, *demand[s] union of minds and opinions,* and claims from Catholics that they should, as it were in a phalanx, rush with one accord against the common foe; but which is compelled to mourn over division of opinions, sometimes the severing of hearts, and *the bluntness or even unfitness of those arms which are used against the enemy.* Our Holy Father would desire these men to think of such things while they read your book; and he congratulates you because you have contributed labour and thought to the dispelling prejudices and *recalling wandering minds to the path of truth.* And, while he augurs for you a most copious fruit of the labour you have undertaken by God's help, he very lovingly imparts to you his Apostolic Benediction as a pledge of God's blessing and of his own fatherly good will.

Having expressed this *according to the office entrusted me,* I rejoice to testify to you my own peculiar esteem and respect, praying from God for you all things happy and salutary.—Most illustrious Sir,

Your most devoted and obedient Servant,

FRANCISCO MERCURELLI,

S. Dm. S. ab litteris latinis.*

Rome, Oct. 22, 1864.

* The original Latin will be found in the *Monde* of Nov. 7, 1864.

From Mgr. Mercurelli's letter we may draw some important inferences: (1.) So far from exhorting Catholics to any kind of agitation against liberty of worships and of the press in those countries where it exists, the Pope distinctly implies that, under such circumstances, more "grievous evils" would ensue from resisting than from "enduring" it. Yet he declares (2) that these "boasted liberties" are in themselves neither "approvable nor useful," but, on the contrary, are greatly instrumental in producing "the present evils of human society;" nay (3) that this has, in fact, been authoritatively taught by Gregory XVI., and (4) that "humble submission" is due to that teaching. (5.) His reason for so strongly wishing all Catholics to embrace the truth on this matter, is the inestimable importance at this time of union among them. Yet at the same time (6) he teaches that the legitimate way for a good Catholic to forward such union, is not to waive the question as comparatively unimportant, but the very contrary; to vindicate the sound doctrine as an integral part of Catholic Truth, and to press on his brethren the obligation under which they lie of dutifully accepting it as such.

The rest of our argument is comparatively easy, though far from unimportant. We are to show that the last seven classes of condemned propositions are directed against revolutionism, either in its extreme or more mitigated shape; and we are to give some brief comment on these respective propositions.

Now revolutionists assault Christian society in two different ways: by practical action and by the diffusion of speculative tenets. Their machinations of the former kind are condemned in the fourth class under the title, "Socialism, Communism, Secret Societies, Bible Societies, Clerico-liberal Societies." The first two names here recounted may seem, indeed, to clash a little with our exposition of the arrangement of the Encyclical; for Socialism and Communism, it may be said, are rather speculative systems than practical organizations. But the fact is otherwise. They are based, of course, upon certain abstract tenets; but their main importance and their main danger consist, not in the reasoning advanced for their support, but in the restless and unrelenting political action which they prompt and sustain. Another particular in this fourth class may at first astonish an Englishman, viz., the mention of Bible societies in so hideous a company. This fact, however, when duly pondered, will only remind us of a melancholy but undeniable fact. Englishmen, so conservative at home, throw their whole influence abroad into the revolutionary scale; and, in their blind and benighted religious ignorance, devote

a degree of zeal which might grace a better cause, to the purpose of exciting the mind of foreign peoples against that religion which is the one conservative principle of Europe.

The remaining classes contain the speculative tenets of revolutionism. The fifth denies the Church's divinely given prerogatives, while the sixth assigns several of those very prerogatives to the State. The seventh comprises the chief among those ethical errors and impieties which are embraced by revolutionists as such. In condemning the eighth and ninth classes, the Holy Father propounds Catholic truth, both on the sacrament of marriage which is the very foundation of Christian society, and also on his civil principedom, which may be called the key-stone of the arch. Lastly, in the ninth class he instructs his flock on the true character of those modern liberties, which certain Catholics have been unhappily duped into admiring. Such is the general drift of these five classes: and we are now to begin with the first of them (the fifth of the whole Syllabus), which regards the Church's intrinsic prerogatives.

The Church, as every Catholic knows, receives her mission and authority immediately from God, and has an indefeasible right, which no civil government may lawfully gainsay, to exercise her allotted functions: the sense, therefore, and the falsehood of props. xix., xx., and xxi. are at once evident. Prop. xxii. was reprobated in the Brief issued on occasion of the Munich Congress, and now commonly called the Munich Brief. In that document the Pope declares, that due "adhesion to revealed truth" is not at all sufficiently secured in a Catholic teacher or writer by his merely accepting the Church's definitions of faith, but that much further intellectual subjection is absolutely required. We have so often written on this subject, and shall so often have occasion in future numbers to enlarge on it, that here we may pass on. In condemning prop. xxiii. the Pontiff lays down that the Church has never exceeded her power, nor usurped the rights of princes; * though he does not (so far) decide whether that

* If the Syllabus could be taken merely as it stands, the Catholic would only be required by the censure of this proposition to hold that *some one* of the three assertions comprised in it is false. But the Apostolic letter to which the Syllabus refers is, of course, equally authoritative with the Syllabus itself; and it, moreover, authentically explains in what sense this proposition is censured. Now the Apostolic letter brands all those assertions comprised in the proposition as false and anti-Catholic. The Pope is censuring the work of a Spanish priest; and after speaking of it most severely in other respects, concludes as follows: "Finally, that we may omit very many of his errors, he advances to that point of *audacity and impiety* as to contend with *unspeakable daring (ausu infando)* that Roman Pontiffs and Œcumenical

temporal authority which she exercised in the middle ages was immediately from God, or accrued to her in some shape from human law or convention. By his censure, however, of prop. xxiv. he does decide that she possesses as her intrinsic right a certain temporal power, at least indirect; and in the detailed condemnation to which the Syllabus refers, he explains this to mean "a coercitive power in order that wanderers may return to the path of justice." A similar conclusion, moreover, results from his having condemned the 16th proposition, recited above (p. 455) in the "*Quantâ Curâ*." It follows, therefore, that not merely the civil power has received from God the right of chastising offences against the Church, but that the Church herself (within certain limits which the Pope does not here lay down) can require the secular arm to inflict such chastisements in her behalf. In like manner the Pope's censure of prop. xxv. teaches, as we understand it, that bishops have a certain temporal power inherent in the episcopate, and not derived from the civil government. The next two propositions deny the Church's right to temporal possessions; while props. xxviii. and xxix. are so monstrously Erastian, that comment would be an impertinence. By reprobating the three next propositions, the Holy Father teaches that various civil immunities, which have been enjoyed at divers times and places by ecclesiastical persons, do not accrue from concession of the State, but are of higher origin: for instance, that an ecclesiastical tribunal for judging the temporal causes of clerics, whether civil or criminal, cannot be lawfully destroyed by a government (as was done in 1852 by that of New Grenada), without permission of the Holy See; and that the exempting clerics from military conscription is required by natural justice and equity, if only the Church's essential character be admitted. The propositions from xxxiii. to xxxvii., inclusively, are so obviously contrary to the very rudiments of Catholic doctrine, that no explanation of them can be needed;* while prop. xxxviii. clearly implies that the spiritual power claimed by Popes of the period was excessive. Lastly, in the same class with these propositions should be ranked the 14th, 15th, 16th, and 19th of those which we specified above (see p. 455) as condemned in the body of the Encyclical.

The sixth class relates directly to civil society. And firstly is condemned (prop. xxxix.) that view so dear to revolutionists,

Councils have exceeded the limits of their power, usurped the rights of princes, and even erred in defining matters of faith and morals."

* We must admit, however, that, having no access to Nuytz's condemned book, we do not know the precise meaning of prop. xxxiv., which is one of his.

which would exalt the State into an unlimited and irresponsible power; which would maintain, that not merely ecclesiastical rights, but those also of family and property, derive their origin therefrom. Prop. xl. would divorce the interests of this world and the next, and represent true theological doctrine as adverse in tendency to man's temporal good. The next four propound tenets adverse to the very notion of the Church's spiritual independence, as is evident on a single perusal. The four which follow (xlv.—xlviii.) concern education: they defend on principle that line of policy—the most appalling peril which now threatens the Church—the removal of education from Church control, and the limiting it (at least chiefly) to purely secular studies. Then comes another batch of four (xlix.—lii.), so intolerably Erastian as to need no comment of ours. By his censure of prop. liii. the Holy Father teaches, in addition to more obvious truths, that the civil power cannot lawfully give assistance to those unhappy religious who may wish sacrilegiously to violate their solemn vows.* Prop. liv. again is openly and intolerably Erastian; while prop. lv. renews an error already condemned in Lamennais. In this sixth class should also be counted many of those propositions which were condemned (see pp. 454, 5) in the body of the Encyclical: viz., the 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 17th, and 18th.

The seventh class contains various ethical errors which are involved in revolutionary tenets. Prop. lvi. is thus introduced in the Allocation, "*Maxima quidem*" to which the Syllabus refers:—

Nor do [these men] fear accordingly to protest that the prophecies and miracles recorded and narrated in Scripture are poetical fictions, and the holy mysteries of our divine Faith a result of philosophical investigations, and that in the sacred books of both Testaments are contained mythical inventions, and that the Lord Jesus Christ Himself (horrible to relate!) is a mythical fiction. Wherefore these most revolutionary [turbulentissimi] cultivators of a false morality cry out that the laws of morality require no Divine sanction, and that there is no need for human laws being conformed to the law of nature, or receiving their obligatory power from God.

This is the proposition before us; and the Pope proceeds immediately to say that these men deny the existence of a Divine Law altogether. We see, then, plainly what is the error here condemned. These misbelievers, as acknowledging no Divine Law at all, must hold both that God has made no

* Here, as in a former case, reference to the original documents will show that the Pope intends to condemn *all* the respective assertions contained in this proposition.

revelation of His Will, and also that reason is altogether unable to discover it. From this, therefore, they naturally infer, that such moral maxims as man's corrupt nature devises, should be accepted, without any question how far they are sanctioned by God; and that human laws need not be conformed to any Natural Law, because there is none such. Prop. lvii. asserts that philosophy on the one hand, and civil law on the other, owe no obedience to ecclesiastical authority—an error against which we are constantly protesting in this Review. The next four propositions give theoretical expression to that quintessence of pride and worldliness, that arrogant contempt for all superior authority, that shameless refusal of all submission to the principle of right as such, that unchastened and insane pursuit of temporal aggrandisement, which constitute revolutionism in its full growth. We do not understand the Pope to intend that such maxims are always openly avowed, but that they habitually influence the conduct of these evil men.* Prop. lxii. expresses the tenet, now sometimes avowed as almost axiomatic, that no nation should interfere with another's concerns unless its own interests are tangibly affected:—a miserable declension, indeed, from the Catholic doctrine of international charity! In the specified Allocution, Pius condemns with great indignation the application of this tenet to his civil principedom, and the permission given by European governments to the perpetration of wrong. By censuring prop. lxiii. the Pope enforces the doctrine of non-resistance to legitimate civil authority; and on this we must briefly pause. Now, firstly, the term "princes" in this as in all other such theological declarations, stands not merely for absolute kings, but equally for the sovereign civil authority in a country constitutionally governed.† So much being understood, in order to apprehend the force of this censure we will cite the first of those four passages to which the Syllabus refers:—

"Labour to inculcate on the Christian people due obedience and subjection towards princes and powers, teaching them, according to the Apostle's admonition, that there is no power except from God, and that those who resist the power resist God's ordinance, and so obtain for themselves damnation: and therefore that *the precept of obeying it can never be violated by any one without sin* (citra piaculum), unless, *haply, anything be commanded in opposition to the laws of God and the Church.*"

* For instance, prop. lviii. stands thus in the original Allocution:—"Nor do these men recognize any other strength except material force; and they make all moral discipline and virtue to consist in accumulating and increasing wealth, &c."

† See M. Godard, "Principes de '89," p. 87, with the quotation from Suarez.

The second passage repeats this almost word for word. So far, then, we have two doctrines infallibly pronounced:—(1) legitimate governments are not to be obeyed in things which they may command contrary to the laws of God and of the Church; (2) they are to be obeyed in every other possible case. One question, however, is left open—Is there, or is there not, some imaginable degree of tyranny and oppression, or some other possible circumstance, which would expel guilty rulers from the position of “legitimate” princes? On this we have spoken in the first article of our present number. So much, then, on prop. lxiii. Prop. lxiv. expresses that most unchristian love of their country’s temporal aggrandisement, and that disregard of all moral obligations in the pursuit of such aggrandisement, which is the special disgrace of those revolutionists who claim to themselves the name of “patriots.” Lastly, among the propositions which are condemned in the body of the Encyclical, those referable to the sixth class are the 4th and 5th.

Under the eighth class various errors are condemned, which have been recently advocated on the sacrament of marriage. No subject more imperatively required mention in combating revolutionism; for, as we have already observed, the Catholic law of marriage lies at the very foundation of Christian society.* At the same time, a detailed examination of these errors would lead us into a theological direction so very different from any which we have hitherto pursued in this article, that we think the present is not a good occasion for pursuing it. Suffice it to say, that one great end of these decrees is to protest against the flagrant usurpation attempted from time to time by civil governments, over the Church’s divinely given authority throughout the whole subject.

* It would be an important part of our duty as Catholic reviewers to expose the miserable results which are flowing, and which will continue ever more calamitously to flow, from the recent change of marriage law in England,—were it not that there are almost insurmountable difficulties in the way of arguing publicly on such a question. We shall do good service, however, by putting before our readers the following frank avowal, to be found in the *Saturday Review* of Jan. 28, 1865. “The case [a particular case recently decided] has its value because it seems to have awakened certain suspicions as to the value of that change in the law which has facilitated divorce. . . . The worst fears of those who, in the interests of public morality, deprecated a change in the marriage laws, have been realized. . . . The plea upon which facilities were given to divorce was, of course, that of public policy; and in this aspect the [recent] case is an illustrative one. . . . [The present] is an odd state of things, which does not conduce to public morality. Under the old law it would have been impossible.” We may add that, in proportion as the morality takes root among Protestants which this law must generate, the dangers will become even more fearful, which at present are alarming enough, of familiar intimacy between Catholics and Protestants.

Under the ninth class two errors are condemned on the Pope's civil principedom; and the faithful are commanded "to hold most firmly" that doctrine concerning it, which the Pope has already taught on various occasions. That doctrine, as our readers are well aware, is substantially as follows:—That the civil principedom has been conferred by a special favour of Divine Providence; and that under present circumstances it is necessary, for enabling the Pope freely to govern the Church without subjection to an earthly king. In addition, however, to this fundamental necessity, there are two reasons (we think) which must make this civil principedom very dear to an intelligent Catholic. Firstly, in the Roman alone of civil governments is there so much as an attempt practically to put in force that Catholic doctrine, which prescribes spiritual good as the ruler's predominant aim.* Then, secondly, no earnest Catholic will willingly give up the hope that at a future time some reaction may take place in European society towards a more reasonable constitution of Church and State; but the Pope's civil principedom is an integral part of such constitution, and its overthrow therefore would indefinitely impede the fulfilment of this pious aspiration.

In the tenth class the modern "liberties" are once more condemned; and here we are to consider what lessons on this head are expressly inculcated in the Encyclical and Syllabus. The relevant propositions are the three first of those recited (p. 454) from the Encyclical, and props. lxxvii., lxxviii., and lxxix. of the Syllabus. And the very circumstance that there is a certain question among Catholics as to the sense in which some of these propositions are censured, makes it important to repeat what we have already said; viz., that we express our own humble opinion, in most perfect submission to those authorities with whom the decision resides. But before particularly treating these several propositions, we must premise a very few remarks on the principle which is to guide us in determining their interpretation.

In studying any doctrinal declaration of the Pope, it seems to us that Catholics have to be on their guard against two extremes. On the one hand, it is not to be permitted that any one should labour to invest the Papal words with the widest possible significance, for the purpose of obtaining an

* "The Church is the supreme ruler of all the actions of men, and rules them on principles of her own, having no other object than the salvation of souls. . . . She has simply so to get men through this life that they may escape a terrible condemnation in the next. Elsewhere this is a theory; but in Rome the Pope is sovereign, and tries to make it a reality."—*Saturday Review*, Oct. 8, 1864.

apparent sanction to his own personal line of thought; yet neither, on the other hand, can it be right to aim at reducing their scope to a minimum: the question is not what the Holy Father's words *may be understood* to mean, but purely and simply what they *do* mean. Applying this general principle to the particular case of condemned propositions, it is held by all theologians that these are to be renounced, not in every sense which they can legitimately bear; nor yet only, on the other hand, in any sense one pleases, which can be reconciled with their actual wording: but in that sense in which, as the context and circumstances may show, the Pope intended to condemn them. There cannot be a better illustration of our meaning than the third proposition condemned in the "*Quantâ Curâ*" itself. The Pope teaches—(1) that "not a few men" maintain this proposition; and (2) that they infer it from that "totally false idea of social government" which he has just denounced. We must find some interpretation, then, which combines these two conditions. If there is but one such, in that sense the proposition must be rejected; if more than one can be assigned, it may probably suffice to reject the proposition, as understood according to *any one* of these various interpretations. In like manner as to the Syllabus. It embraces, says Pius IX., those "chief errors of our age," which he has already censured. To reject any proposition therein recited, then, merely in some sense in which no man living holds it, is (so far) no real fulfilment of a Catholic's obligation. Such are the simple and obvious maxims applicable to the inquiry before us.

The sense of prop. lxxvii. is so clear, that there neither is nor can be any difference of opinion on the matter. The Allocution on which it is founded refers in particular to Spain: and it is perhaps somewhat remarkable, that no express censure of the proposition is to be found therein; though such censure is of course implied throughout.

As regards prop. lxxviii., it has been argued that a Catholic may ascribe to it the very widest sense which its words can possibly bear. The proposition, on this view, eulogises a permission given in some country for all immigrants without exception,—immigrants whether present or future,—to practise their religious rites; however atrocious those rites might be, or however openly offensive to public morality. And it is contended that, by rejecting this truly monstrous opinion—an opinion, indeed, which no one has ever dreamed of maintaining—a Catholic will satisfy the Holy Father's requirement. But we must submit earnestly that no such interpretation is tenable for a moment. In the original Allocution the Pope

comments severely on a decree enacted by the Republic of New Grenada, permitting to immigrants the free exercise of their respective worships. He does not profess, nor has it ever been alleged, that such permission extended to any such outrageous length as that above mentioned. It was neither more nor less than such liberty of conscience as is granted to immigrants in the great majority of European countries; the only difference of the two cases being, that in New Grenada religious unity had up to that period been maintained inviolate. The Pope, however, protests against this decree as injurious to the Church.* Moreover, we know from his present pronouncement, that the Allocution of 1854 was one of those Apostolic Letters wherein he warned "*all children of the Church*" against the plague of modern error; or, in other words, that he issued it *ex cathedra* in his capacity of universal teacher, apart from the Syllabus altogether.† The Allocution, then, if it stood alone, requires of Catholics an interior belief, that such liberty of worship as was granted to immigrants in New Grenada was injurious to the Church's rights and liberty. But further, this Allocution is not only authoritative in itself, but it supplies the one authentic exposition of prop. lxxviii.; and the proposition, therefore, cannot surely, without manifest unfairness, be understood otherwise, than of such liberty to immigrants as was then granted in New Grenada. Many persons exist, who, regarding the civil enforcement of religious unity as "no longer expedient in this our age" (prop. lxxvii.), think, therefore, that New Grenada acted "laudably" in this matter: such an opinion is here authoritatively censured. The word "hinc" indeed seems as though it had been prefixed on purpose to determine unmistakably the sense of prop. lxxviii. The present inexpediency of excluding from a country all non-Catholic worships (prop. lxxvii.) would be an extremely good ground (if such inexpediency existed) for eulogising the removal of that exclusion in some given country, such as New Grenada; but it could be no possible ground for praising so monstrous a measure, as permission accorded for rites openly offensive to public morality.

The whole preceding argument equally applies to prop. lxxix. The Allocution on which this censure is based refers to an act of the Mexican Convention, establishing such liberty of worships and of the press as obtains in most

* "Reproving the above-mentioned decrees, we again and again demanded that they might obtain no result, and that the Church might enjoy her rights and full liberty."

† See Cardinal Antonelli's letter at the end of this article.

countries of Europe; and it is in respect, therefore, of such liberty, that the proposition is condemned. And here, too, we should not fail to consider the introductory particle "*enimvero*," prefixed in the Syllabus; for this particle implies that prop. lxxix. is held by erroneous thinkers as an *argument* for props. lxxvii. and lxxviii. On our interpretation this runs most naturally. If it were false (prop. lxxix.) that the liberty of non-Catholic worships and publications conduces to indifference and moral corruption, it might legitimately be inferred that in our age the prohibition of such liberty is no longer expedient (prop. lxxvii.); and that those countries act laudably (prop. lxxviii.) which remove that prohibition.

Passing from the Syllabus to the Encyclical itself, the two first propositions there censured carry with them their own interpretation. Of the third we need not speak, as we believe that no doctrine follows from its condemnation which is not equally established by that of the remaining five.

Having now arrived, we hope, at a true interpretation of these censures, we are next to consider their doctrinal bearing. We will refer, first of all, to the second error condemned in the Encyclical; and we start with the obvious remark that Pius IX., by uttering that condemnation, claims for the civil government a right of punishing offenders against the Catholic religion, even in cases where the public peace does not require such punishment. In other words, the Pope teaches—(1) that the State has received from God authority to inflict punishment, for some end altogether distinct from that of public peace, or of protecting person and property; and (2) that an end distinctly supernatural is in nowise beyond its legitimate sphere; for that it has received from God authority to punish offenders against Catholicism simply as such. Next, as regards props. lxxvii. and lxxviii., it must be remembered that what is unjust can never be "*expedient*" to the Church; nor can abstaining from injustice be otherwise than "*laudable*." The Pope, therefore, by condemning these propositions, decrees that there is no injustice in "*treating Catholicism as the only religion of a State*," and "*in excluding all other worships*." This may be unjust, no doubt, under particular circumstances; but the Pope decides that in itself it is not unjust. Yet it is quite impossible but that in every country some perverse men will arise, who sincerely (we are far from saying inculpably) hold opinions contradictory to Catholicism; and the Pope therefore decides that there is nothing intrinsically unjust in forbidding non-Catholics to profess and practise those various religions, which they nevertheless sincerely regard as true. Among the "*liberal Catholics*," indeed, there are not a

few who will accept this statement; but who are at all events eager in maintaining that the time for such repression has long since passed away. "Give liberty," they say, "there where you are masters, that you may have liberty there where you are slaves." Accordingly, they denounce that intolerance which so happily exists *e.g.* in Spain, as being, if not unjust, at least in the nineteenth century most inexpedient and most prejudicial to the interests of Catholicism. This is precisely prop. lxxvii. now once more directly and formally condemned. Then there is another tenet which such thinkers sometimes advocate: "As civilization advances," they say, "a certain sacredness accrues to personal convictions, however erroneous, which did not exist in more barbarous times. Without condemning, therefore, the mediæval Church, we may maintain that in these days the conscientious beliefs, however divergent, of individual citizens, should be treated by the State with equal favour and with absolute impartiality." This is the first error condemned in the body of the Encyclical: the error, namely, that "civil progress" requires society to be governed without any distinction between the true religion and false ones. Lastly, the censure of prop. lxxix. teaches us that liberty of worships and of the press, instead of being a social advance, is a deplorable retrogression, as tending to the corruption of morals and the propagation of a pestilential indifferentism.

Summing up, then, the results of this brief inquiry, and without referring to any other authoritative pronouncements than the two now before us, the following doctrines are herein established. (1.) The State has received authority from God to inflict punishment, for some end altogether distinct from that of public peace. (2.) The pursuit of an end distinctly supernatural is in no wise beyond the State's legitimate sphere. (3.) The State has received, indeed, authority from God to punish offenders against Catholicism simply as such. (4.) There is nothing intrinsically unjust in restraining all non-Catholics by material force from the profession and practice of those various religions which they sincerely regard as true. (5.) Nor is it prejudicial to the interests of Catholicism, even at the present day, that under certain circumstances, such as those existing in Spain, a state should practise rigidly this intolerance towards all religious error.* (6.) Nor, again, does the advance of true civilization require that society should be governed without any distinction between the true religion and false ones. (7.) Liberty of worships and liberty of the press

* See, on these questions, the remarks in our last number, pp. 62-68.
VOL. IV.—NO. VIII. [*New Series.*]

conduce to moral corruption, and to the spread of that devastating plague, religious indifferentism.

At the same time, none of these doctrines are inconsistent with the opinion which we have already expressed, that the true service of material force is to retain a country in that religious unity which she possesses, not to reinstate her in that which she has long unhappily lost. Nor is there, we believe, a Catholic living who would wish to see it now employed for the latter end.

Proposition lxxx. has been so wildly misinterpreted by the anti-Catholic press, that our one safe course is to place before our readers an extract from the original Allocution, far longer than under other circumstances would have been necessary. Our extract starts with the very commencement of the Allocution, "*jamdudum cernimus.*"

Long since we have seen, Venerable Brethren, by how deplorable a conflict civil society is ravaged, especially in this our most miserable age, between truth and error, virtue and vice, light and darkness; and this, because of the mutually repugnant principles [animating either side]. For some on one side uphold certain tenets of modern civilization *as they call it*; others on the other defend the rights of justice and of our most holy religion. And the first-named men demand that the Roman Pontiff should reconcile and harmonize himself [se reconciliet et componat] with progress, with liberalism (as they call it), and with modern civilization. But the others deservedly claim that the immoveable principles of eternal justice be preserved pure and inviolate, and the most healthful influence of our divine religion be fully preserved. . . . But the advocates of modern civilization do not acquiesce in a contrast of this kind, because they affirm that they are true and sincere friends of religion. And we should be willing to credit them, did not most miserable facts which are daily before the eyes of all show the very contrary. For there is one true and holy religion upon earth, founded and instituted by the Lord Christ himself, which, the fruitful parent and nurse of all virtues, and the expeller of vice, and the liberator of souls, and the guide to true felicity, is called the Catholic Apostolic Roman. . . . But, now, of those who invite us to stretch forth our hand to the civilization of the day for the good of religion, we ask whether facts are of such a nature as could induce Christ's vicar . . . [to think] that without a most grievous violation of conscience and the greatest scandal to all, he would unite himself with the civilization of the day, by the agency of which so many deplorable evils come to pass, so many most foul opinions, errors, and principles are promulgated, in opposition to the Catholic religion and its teaching. . . .

But this modern civilization, while it favours every non-Catholic worship, and does not keep back the very infidels from filling public offices, and opens Catholic schools to their children,—exercises its wrath against religious orders, against institutes founded for the direction of Catholic schools, against very many ecclesiastical men of every grade, even those invested with the highest

dignity . . . nay, even against eminent laymen, who being devoted to us and to this Holy See, defend zealously the cause of religion and justice. This civilization, while it gives largesses to non-Catholic institutions and persons, robs the Catholic Church of its most just possessions, and *devotes its whole thought and study to the diminution of that Church's salutary influence.*

Could the Roman Pontiff, then, ever stretch forth the right hand of friendship to such civilization as this? . . . Let things have back their true appellation and this Holy See will be ever consistent with itself. *She has herself been in truth the patroness and cultivator of true civilization;* and historical records most loudly testify and prove that from this same See, there has been in every age diffused into the most distant and barbarous regions of the world true and legitimate refinement of manners, cultivation, wisdom. But when a system *desires to be called by the name of civilization*, which has been exquisitely adapted to the weakening, possibly to the destroying, of Christ's Church, never certainly will this Holy See and the Roman Pontiff be able to come to terms [convenire] with such civilization.

This extract places it beyond doubt that the Holy Father disapproves modern civilization, so far, and so far only, as it is anti-Catholic; and every one who assents to this disapproval thus generally stated, does all that is required of him by the condemnation of prop. lxxx. The censure, indeed, of prop. xii. implies that "the free progress of science" is an important good; and the censure of the 5th and 6th, among those which we extracted (p. 454) from the body of the Encyclical, implies that there is a genuine political economy, and that its conclusions are solid and valuable. At the same time, if we may express in our own language the full truth which we believe the Pope to intend, we should say that so far as modern civilization is in accordance with those Catholic social theses which we have enumerated in this article (pp. 469, 470), it is a real blessing and a healthy growth; but that so far as it conflicts with those theses it is a very serious calamity. Since, however, such general expressions at last convey but little definite meaning, and since the question is one of some interest and importance, we cannot perhaps more appropriately conclude the present article than by considering this last of the eighty propositions in somewhat more detail than any one of the rest.

The mediæval period had two different characteristics: for, on the one hand, it is the only epoch wherein the normal relations of Church and State have been theoretically accepted; while, on the other hand, it was a time of rude and savage lawlessness, of widely-extended ignorance, of vehement and unrestrained passion. Accordingly, liberals are in the habit of attacking any one who looks back on it with regret and

admiration, as though he were expressing a preference for violence over gentleness, for rudeness over refinement, and for ignorance over knowledge. Such a preference, however, would be not only paradoxical, but actually disloyal to the Church, which has ever been, so far as society would permit, the great promoter of true and legitimate civilization, and which, during the middle ages, did in fact work marvels in that direction. We speak especially here of the period antecedent to the Papal residence at Avignon. We are far from denying that the removal to that city may have been at the time a less evil than any other feasible alternative; but any one who studies Pius IX.'s teaching on his civil principedom, must at once recognize the very serious evils involved in that Avignon arrangement. The Pope's inherent prerogatives are, of course, ever the same; but their efficacy in practice must have been indefinitely impeded by the Pope being exhibited to the world as in closest relations with one particular monarch, rather than as the common father of all Christian princes. Moreover, this evil was no sooner at an end, than it was succeeded by another still more grievous—the plague of anti-popes. The circumstances of that wretched time permitted—in some sense necessitated,—the assumption, both by kings and by national churches, of an attitude towards the Holy See which was truly deplorable, and which arrived at its culminating point in the Emperor's position during the Council of Constance. This false position led naturally to the prevalence of false principles; and these false principles had their legitimate result in the great European apostasy, headed by Luther and Calvin. The result is, that civilization has, in fact, advanced during all its later stages on principles which have been to a grievous extent false and anti-Christian. Civilization, considered in itself and in the abstract, is a signal good; but when we look at modern civilization as it has, in fact, advanced, we find that its good, on the whole, has been outbalanced by its evil.

We cannot, in any other way, so clearly explain what we mean to express, as by making an imaginary supposition. Let us suppose, then, that after the death of Boniface VIII. and his successor, the ecclesiastical position had remained without any change; nay (as we are dealing with purely imaginary suppositions), let us suppose that, during the centuries which have followed, practice had corresponded with theory very far more closely than it ever did or ever will. On such an hypothesis, what would have been the course of events? The reader need hardly be reminded that our answer to this question will exhibit a picture in itself purely ideal; but yet it is one to which, we believe, facts would more nearly have

approached, in proportion as (1) the Church was more wisely and Catholically governed; in proportion as (2) her children in general were more loyal, docile, obedient; and in proportion (3) as civil rulers in particular gave freer scope to her legitimate influence and intervention. And here, as in other parts of this article, we must make various statements, which space does not permit us to develop at length or to confirm by argument and illustration.

We hold confidently that the work of civilization, ordinarily so called, would have advanced under these normal circumstances far more rapidly than it has in fact; that each successive century would have found the European populations far more submissive to the laws, far less disposed to mutual aggression, far more refined in manners, far better provided with the temporal comforts and enjoyments of life, and, at all events, not less advanced in intellectual culture, than has been historically the case. Let us begin our view with the last-named particular, intellectual culture. It is evidently the Creator's intention that the small body of laymen who are exempted from the necessity of toiling for their subsistence or for personal comfort, should labour directly for the good of society, by intellectual exertions of one or other kind; these men, therefore, should receive the very highest intellectual education which circumstances will permit. No one, we believe, will question that the Church has ever acted on this view, though many think she has pursued the end by mistaken means; and for ourselves, as we dissent altogether from this latter opinion, we must hold that the Church's greater influence would but have more effectually promoted the highest education of leisured men. Then as regards the middle class, in no age have clerics shown themselves less desirous than laymen (but much the contrary) of promoting its solid instruction. For the lower orders, Pius IX. has undoubtedly laid down that in their education religious doctrine should ever have in such sense the primary place, that all other instruction shall be (as it were) an adjunct;* but we should confidently maintain that such doctrine, taught effectively, supplies the most solid intellectual instruction which they can, in their circumstances, possibly receive. From the intellectual growth, then, thus proceeding, various consequences would ensue on our imaginary hypothesis, both in politics and in science. As to the former, the leisured and highly-instructed class would take the main and prominent share in their country's temporal government;

* See our last number, p. 235, note.

and in matters purely secular their united opinion would dictate its political maxims and principles.* The more promising youths of the middle and lower class, no less than those of the higher, would be constantly drafted into the clerical order; and if the intellectual education of these classes were really solid so far as it went, they would themselves see how much more safely their interests could be entrusted to the keeping of ecclesiastical and civil rulers harmoniously co-operating, than to their own comparative shallowness and ignorance.

Turning from politics to secular science, the results of intellectual growth would be such as these. Leisured laymen would, of course, be taught Christian doctrine with far greater completeness and depth than is required for others; and they would be also trained to recognize the absolute supremacy of theology over all other sciences, in case of any apparent conflict. Still, from the very fact of their being laymen, it is probable that in almost every case they would wish to employ their more profound and systematic studies in some direction not theological. We see no possible reason for doubt, that both metaphysical and experimental science would have advanced as rapidly as it has in fact; that the press, the railway, the electric telegraph, would have been introduced as certainly and much more beneficially. It is probable enough, indeed, that a Galileo might have been condemned by a Pontifical congregation; but no greater injury would thence have accrued to astronomy than did in history accrue. Further, one consideration should be carefully borne in mind. The world would have been saved, on our hypothesis, from the monstrous misdirection of human energy which has been caused by those phantoms called national glory and greatness; phantoms, whose pursuit has caused so terrible an amount of bloodshed and misery, and has impeded, in a degree so unspeakably grievous, man's real good, both spiritual and temporal. General philanthropy would thus have become a far stronger and more pervasive principle than it has been in fact. One result of this most happy circumstance would show itself in a special devotion to those particular sciences, which are promoted and maintained, not merely by the desire of knowledge, but eminently by disinterested zeal for the welfare of-mankind. We speak of such sciences, *e.g.*,

* We mean to express in the text that that movement towards absolutism which succeeded the mediæval period seems to us altogether retrogressive, and such as would not have existed had the Church retained due influence. But we do not wish here to lay stress on this.

as medicine; and, again, political science, in its largest sense, comprising, as it does (among other subordinate subjects), jurisprudence and political economy.* Then Pagan literature would doubtless have been revived as it was; but the effects of that revival would have been exclusively beneficial, and not of a mixed character. Lastly, from various circumstances here recounted, it follows that physical comfort, and (still more) refinement of manners, political wisdom, improvement of judicial processes, mercifulness of judicial penalties, would have advanced much more rapidly in this imaginary, than they have in the historical, Europe.

From temporal good let us proceed to spiritual. The civil ruler would regard it as his highest privilege to co-operate with the Church, in a due attitude of subordination, towards the fulfilment of her Divine commission. He would secure to her ministers the freest exercise of their functions; he would protect her in the enjoyment of her property and of those civil immunities which are hers by Divine right (see props. xxx., xxxi., xxxii.); he would rejoice in multiplying endowments for priests, churches, and schools. The Church, on her side, would attempt no peremptory and dictatorial course: on the contrary, she would consult frankly and freely with him on the main particulars of those spiritual measures which are for his interest no less really than for hers; and would, in various details, carefully accommodate her enactments to his wishes. Meanwhile, he would hold it as among the most sacred and elementary of his duties, to use the force at his command for the purpose of repressing any attempt to introduce into the country heresy or schism; though the measures necessary for that purpose would, in all probability, be very much less severe than those required by mediæval circumstances.† He would co-operate with the Church in exercising a strict censorship over the press, as regards any matters even indirectly connected with moral and spiritual truth; in order that public opinion concerning such matters may be in absolute subjection to the Church's authoritative teaching. The various nations of Europe would thus be united in bonds of sympathy, animated by the same spirit, directed towards the same end; while the common father of Christendom would be the international arbiter where contentions might arise. European

* We cannot recommend too earnestly a most admirable paper by Mr. John O'Hagan on this latter science, in the very last number of the "*Atlantis*" which appeared, viz., that for January, 1860.

† See our January number, p. 65.

opinion would be essentially Christian; and each people would regard its true greatness as consisting, not in territorial aggrandisement or military prowess, but in services rendered to the cause of religion, and in devotion manifested to the Vicar of Christ.

Such is a most imperfect outline of that true and legitimate civilization, as we conceive it, which the Church would eagerly promote. And all who admit that we have truly conceived it, will also admit that the course along which society has in fact moved during these later centuries has been far more retrograde than progressive; that it has given a preposterous preference to the material order over the moral; and has dethroned the Church from her rightful supremacy. So far as these are its habits of thought and methods of action, the Holy Father could not possibly express or imply approval of its constitution—could not meditate, in any degree, the bringing himself into harmony with its maxims,—without betraying those very truths and interests which it is his sacred mission to testify and to protect.

Since this article was in type, we have received the French "Recueil" of Papal Documents; and find in it Cardinal Antonelli's circular to the bishops on forwarding them the Encyclical and Syllabus. This letter is so important in showing the precise authority of the latter, that we should be inexcusable in not presenting it to our readers. It will be found to afford another illustration of our statement (see p. 448), that very many pronouncements of the Holy Father are really addressed to the Universal Church, and concern, therefore, the whole episcopal body, which do not in their actual form express this fact. We are obliged to translate the circular from the French translation. In that translation it runs as follows; and the first sentence, as will be seen, is taken almost verbatim from the Encyclical:—

"Our Holy Father, Pius IX., Sovereign Pontiff, being profoundly anxious for the salvation of souls and for sound doctrine, has never ceased from the commencement of his Pontificate to proscribe and condemn the chief errors and false doctrines of our most unhappy age, by his published Encyclicals, and Consistorial Allocutions, and other Apostolic Letters. But as it may happen that all the Pontifical acts do not reach each one of the ordinaries, the same Sovereign Pontiff has willed that a Syllabus of the same errors should be compiled, to be sent to all the bishops of the Catholic world.

in order that these bishops may have before their eyes all the errors and pernicious doctrines which he has reprobated and condemned.

He has consequently charged me to take care that this Syllabus, having been printed, should be sent to your [Eminence] on this occasion and at this time when the same Sovereign Pontiff, from his great solicitude for the salvation and [general] good of the Catholic Church and of the whole flock divinely entrusted to him, has thought well to write another Encyclical Letter to all the Catholic bishops. Accordingly, performing, as is my duty, with all suitable zeal and submission the commands of the said Pontiff, I send your [Eminence] the said Syllabus together with this letter.

I seize with much pleasure this occasion of expressing my sentiments of respect and devotion to your [Eminence], and of once more subscribing myself, while I humbly kiss your hands,

Your [Eminence's] most humble and devoted servant,

G. CARD. ANTONELLI.

Rome, Dec. 8, 1864.

DIE VIII. DECEMBRIS, MDCCCLXIV.

SS. DOMINI NOSTRI PII IX.

EPISTOLA ENCYCLICA.

VENERABILIBUS FRATRIBUS PATRIARCHIS, PRIMATIBUS, ARCHIEPISCOPIS ET
EPISCOPIS UNIVERSIS GRATIAM ET COMMUNIONEM APOSTOLICÆ SEDIS
HABENTIBUS.

PIUS PAPA IX.

VENERABILES FRATRES,

SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

Quanta cura ac pastorali vigilantia Romani Pontifices Prædecessores Nostri, exsequentes demandatum sibi ab ipso Christo Domino in persona Beatissimi Petri Apostolorum Principis officium, munusque pascendi agnos et oves nunquam intermiserint universum Dominicum gregem sedulo enutrire verbis fidei, ac salutari doctrina imbuere, eumque ab venenatis pascuis arcere, omnibus quidem ac Vobis præsertim compertum, exploratumque est, Venerabiles Fratres. Et sane iidem Decessores Nostri, augustæ catholicæ religionis, veritatis ac justitiæ assertores et vindices, de animarum salute maxime solliciti nihil potius unquam habuere, quam sapientissimis suis Litteris, et Constitutionibus reterege et damnare omnes hæreses et errores, qui Divinæ Fidei nostræ, catholicæ Ecclesiæ doctrinæ, morum honestati, ac sempiternæ hominum salutis adversi, graves frequenter excitarent tempestates, et christianam civilemque rempublicam miserandum in modum funestarent. Quocirca iidem Decessores Nostri Apostolica fortitudine continenter obstiterunt nefariis iniquorum hominum molitionibus, qui despumantes tamquam fluctus feri maris confusiones suas, ac libertatem promittentes, cum servi sint corruptionis, fallacibus suis opinionibus, et perniciosissimis scriptis catholicæ religionis civilisque societatis fundamenta convellere, omnemque virtutem ac justitiam de medio tollere, omniumque animos mentesque depravare, et incautos imperitamque præsertim juventutem a recta morum disciplina avertere, eamque miserabiliter corrumpere, in erroris laqueos inducere, ac tandem ab Ecclesiæ catholicæ sinu avellere conati sunt.

Jam vero, uti Vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, apprime notum est, Nos vix dum arcano divinæ Providentiæ consilio nullis certe Nostriis meritis ad hanc Petri Cathedram evecti fuimus, cum videremus summo animi Nostri dolore horribilem sane procellam tot pravis opinionibus excitatam, et gravissima, ac nunquam satis lugenda damna, quæ in christianum populum ex tot erroribus redundant, pro Apostolici Nostri Ministerii officio illustria Prædecessorum Nostrorum vestigia sectantes Nostram extulimus vocem, ac pluribus in vulgus editis Encyclicis Epistolis et Allocutionibus in Consistorio habitis, aliisque Apostolicis Litteris præcipuos tristissimæ nostræ ætatis errores damnavimus, eximiamque vestram episcopalem vigilantiam excitavimus, et universos catholicæ Ecclesiæ Nobis carissimos filios etiam atque etiam monuimus et exhortati sumus, ut tam diræ contagia pestis omnino horrerent

[*Translation.*]

VIII. DECEMBER, MDCCCLXIV.

THE ENCYCLICAL LETTER

OF OUR MOST HOLY FATHER THE POPE, PIUS IX.

To our Venerable Brethren, all Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops having favour and communion of the Holy See.

PIUS PP. IX.

VENERABLE BRETHREN,

HEALTH AND APOSTOLIC BENEDICTION.

With how great care and pastoral vigilance the Roman Pontiffs, our predecessors, fulfilling the duty and office committed to them by the Lord Christ Himself in the person of most Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, of feeding the lambs and the sheep, have never ceased sedulously to nourish the Lord's whole flock with words of faith and with salutary doctrine, and to guard it from poisoned pastures,—is thoroughly known to all, and especially to You, Venerable Brethren. And truly the same, Our Predecessors, asserters as they were and vindicators of the august catholic religion, of truth, and of justice, being specially anxious for the salvation of souls, had nothing ever more at heart than by their most wise Letters and Constitutions to unveil and condemn all those heresies and errors which, being adverse to our Divine Faith, to the doctrine of the catholic Church, to purity of morals, and to the eternal salvation of men, have frequently excited violent tempests, and have miserably afflicted both Church and State. For which cause the same Our Predecessors, have, with Apostolic fortitude, constantly resisted the nefarious enterprises of wicked men, who, like raging waves of the sea foaming out their own confusion, and promising liberty whereas they are the slaves of corruption, have striven by their deceptive opinions and most pernicious writings to raze the foundations of the catholic religion and of civil society, to remove from among men all virtue and justice, to deprave the mind and judgment of all, to turn away from true moral training unwary persons, and especially inexperienced youth, miserably to corrupt such youth, to lead it into the snares of error, and at length tear it from the bosom of the catholic Church.

But now, as is well known to You, Venerable Brethren, already, scarcely had we been elevated to this Chair of Peter (by the hidden counsel of divine Providence, certainly by no merits of Our own), when, seeing with the greatest grief of Our soul a truly awful storm excited by so many evil opinions, and [seeing also] the most grievous calamities never sufficiently to be deplored which overspread the christian people from so many errors, according to the duty of Our Apostolic Ministry, and following the illustrious example of Our Predecessors, We raised Our voice, and in many published Encyclical Letters and Allocutions delivered in Consistory, and other Apostolic Letters, we condemned the chief errors of this our most unhappy age, and we excited your admirable Episcopal vigilance, and we again and again admonished and exhorted all sons of the catholic Church, to Us most dear, that they should altogether abhor and flee from the contagion of so dire a

et devitarent. Ac præsertim Nostra prima Encyclica Epistola die 9 Novembris anno 1846 Vobis scripta, binisque Allocutionibus, quarum altera die 9 Decembris anno 1854, altera vero 9 Junii anno 1862 in Consistorio a Nobis habita fuit, monstrosa opinionum portenta damnavimus, quæ hac potissimum ætate cum maximo animarum damno, et civilis ipsius societatis detrimento dominantur, quæque non solum catholicæ Ecclesiæ, ejusque salutari doctrinæ ac venerandis juribus, verum etiam sempiternæ naturali legi a Deo in omnium cordibus insculptæ, rectæque rationi maxime adversantur, et ex quibus alii prope omnes originem habent errores.

Etsi autem haud omiserimus potissimos hujusmodi errores sæpe proscribere et reprobare, tamen catholicæ Ecclesiæ causa, animarumque salus Nobis divinitus commissa, atque ipsius humanæ societatis bonum omnino postulant, ut iterum pastorem vestram sollicitudinem excitemus ad alias pravas profligandas opiniones, quæ ex eisdem erroribus, veluti ex fontibus erumpunt. Quæ falsæ ac perversæ opiniones eo magis detestandæ sunt, quod eo potissimum spectant, ut impediatur et amoveatur salutaris illa vis, quam catholica Ecclesia ex divini sui Auctoris institutione et mandato, libere exercere debet usque ad consummationem sæculi non minus erga singulos homines, quam erga nationes, populos summosque eorum Principes, utque de medio tollatur mutua illa inter Sacerdotium et Imperium consiliorum societas et concordia, quæ rei cum sacræ tum civili fausta semper extitit ac salutaris.* Etenim probe noscitis, Venerabiles Fratres, hoc tempore non paucos reperiri, qui civili consortio impium absurdumque *naturalismi*, uti vocant, principium applicantes audent docere, "optimam societatis publicæ rationem, civilemque progressum omnino requirere, ut humana societas constituatur et gubernetur, nullo habito ad religionem respectu, ac si ea non existeret, vel saltem nullo facto veram inter falsasque religiones discrimine." Atque contra sacrarum Litterarum, Ecclesiæ, sanctorumque Patrum doctrinam, asserere non dubitant, "optimam esse conditionem societatis, in qua Imperio non agnoscitur officium coercendi sancitis poenis violatores catholicæ religionis, nisi quatenus pax publica postulet." Ex qua omnino falsa socialis regiminis idea haud timent erroneam illam fovere opinionem catholicæ Ecclesiæ, animarumque saluti maxime exitialem a rec. mem. Gregorio XVI. Prædecessore Nostro *deliramentum* appellatam,† nimirum "libertatem conscientie et cultuum esse proprium cujuscunque hominis jus, quod lege proclamari et asseri debet in omni recte constituta societate, et jus civibus inesse ad omnimodam libertatem nulla vel ecclesiastica, vel civili auctoritate coarctandam, quo suos conceptus quoscunque sive voce, sive typis, sive alia ratione palam publiceque manifestare ac declarare valeant." Dum vero id temere affirmant, haud cogitant et considerant, quod *libertatem perditionis*‡ predicant, et quod "si humanis persuasionibus semper disceptare sit liberum, nunquam deesse poterunt, qui veritati audeant resultare, et de humanæ sapientiæ loquacitate confidere, cum hanc nocentissimam vanitatem

* Gregor. XVI. Epist. Encycl. "*Mirari*." 15 Aug. 1832.

† Eadem Encycl. "*Mirari*."

‡ S. Aug. Epist. 105, al. 166.

pestilence. And especially in Our first Encyclical Letter written to You on Nov. 9, 1846, and in two Allocutions delivered by us in Consistory, the one on Dec. 9, 1854, and the other on June 9, 1862, we condemned the monstrous portents of opinion which prevail especially in this age, bringing with them the greatest loss of souls and detriment of civil society itself; which are grievously opposed also, not only to the catholic Church and her salutary doctrine and venerable rights, but also to the eternal natural law engraven by God in all men's hearts, and to right reason; and from which almost all other errors have their origin.

But, although we have not omitted often to proscribe and reprobate the chief errors of this kind, yet the cause of the catholic Church, and the salvation of souls entrusted to us by God, and the welfare of human society itself, altogether demand that we again stir up your pastoral solicitude to exterminate other evil opinions, which spring forth from the said errors as from a fountain. Which false and perverse opinions are on that ground the more to be detested, because they chiefly tend to this, that that salutary influence be impeded and [even] removed which the catholic Church, according to the institution and command of her divine Author, should freely exercise even to the end of the world—not only over private individuals, but over nations, peoples, and their sovereign princes; and (tend also) to take away that mutual fellowship and concord of counsels between Church and State which has ever proved itself propitious and salutary, both for religious and civil interests. For You well know, Venerable Brethren, that at this time men are found not a few who, applying to civil society the impious and absurd principle of *naturalism*, as they call it, dare to teach that “the best constitution of public society and [also] civil progress altogether require that human society be conducted and governed without regard being had to religion any more than if it did not exist; or, at least, without any distinction being made between the true religion and false ones.” And, against the doctrine of Scripture, of the Church, and of the holy Fathers, they do not hesitate to assert that “that is the best condition of society, in which no duty is recognized, as attached to the civil power, of restraining, by enacted penalties, offenders against the catholic religion, except so far as public peace may require.” From which totally false idea of social government they do not fear to foster that erroneous opinion, most fatal in its effects on the catholic Church and the salvation of souls, called by Our Predecessor, Gregory XVI., an *insanity*, viz., that “liberty of conscience and worship is each man's personal right, which ought to be legally proclaimed and asserted in every rightly-constituted society; and that a right resides in the citizens to an absolute liberty, which should be restrained by no authority whether ecclesiastical or civil, whereby they may be able openly and publicly to manifest and declare any of their ideas whatever, either by word of mouth, by the press, or in any other way.” But, while they rashly affirm this, they do not think and consider that they are preaching the *liberty of perdition*; and that, “if human arguments are always allowed free room for discussion, there will never be wanting men who will dare to resist truth, and to trust in the flowing speech of human wisdom; whereas we know, from the very teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ, how

quantum debeat fides et sapientia christiana vitare, ex ipsa Domini nostri Jesu Christi institutione cognoscat.*

Et quoniam ubi a civili societate fuit amota religio, ac repudiata divine revelationis doctrina et auctoritas, vel ipsa germana justitiæ humanique juris notio tenebris obscuratur et amittitur, atque in veræ justitiæ legitimique juris locum materialis substituitur vis, inde liquet cur nonnulli certissimis sanæ rationis principiis penitus neglectis posthabitisque audeant conclamare, "voluntatem populi, publica, quam dicunt, opinione vel alia ratione manifestatam constituere supremam legem ab omni divino humanoque jure solutam, et in ordine politico facta consummata, eo ipso quod consummata sunt vim juris habere." Verum equis non videt, planeque sentit, hominum societatem religionis ac veræ justitiæ vinculis solutam nullum aliud profecto propositum habere posse, nisi scopum comparandi, cumulandique opes, nullamque aliam in suis actionibus legem sequi, nisi indomitam animi cupiditatem inserviendi propriis voluptatibus et commodis? Eapropter hujusmodi homines acerbo sane odio insectantur Religiosas Familias quamvis de re christiana, civili, ac litteraria summopere meritas, et blaterant easdem nullam habere legitimam existendi rationem, atque ita hæreticorum commentis plaudunt. Nam ut sapientissime rec. mem. Pius VI. Decessor Noster docebat, "regularium abolitio lædit statum publicæ professionis consiliorum evangelicorum, lædit vivendi rationem in Ecclesia commendatam tamquam Apostolicæ doctrinæ consentaneam, lædit ipsos insignes fundatores; quos super altaribus veneramus, qui non nisi a Deo inspirati eas constituerunt societates."† Atque etiam impie pronunciant, auferendam esse civibus et Ecclesiæ facultatem "qua eleemosynas christianæ caritatis causa palam erogare valeant," ac de medio tollendam legem "qua certis aliquibus diebus opera servilia propter Dei cultum prohibentur," fallacissime pretextentes, commemoratam facultatem et legem optimæ publicæ œconomiae principiis obsistere. Neque contenti amovere religionem a publica societate, volunt religionem ipsam a privatis etiam arcere familiis. Etenim funestissimum *Communismi* et *Socialismi* docentes ac profitentes errorem asserunt "societatem domesticam seu familiam totam suæ existentiae rationem a jure dumtaxat civili mutuari; proindeque ex lege tantum civili dimanare ac pendere jura omnia parentum in filios, cum primis vero jus institutionis educationisque curandæ." Quibus impiis opinionibus, machinationibusque in id præcipue intendunt fallacissimi isti homines, ut salutifera catholice Ecclesiæ doctrina ac vis a juventutis institutione et educatione prorsus eliminetur, ac teneri flexibilesque juvenum animi perniciosis quibusque erroribus, vitiisque misere inficiantur ac depraventur. Siquidem omnes, qui rem tum sacram, tum publicam perturbare, ac rectum societatis ordinem evertere, et jura omnia divina et humana delere sunt conati, omnia nefaria sua consilia, studia et operam in improvidam præsertim juventutem decipiendam ac depravandam, ut supra innuimus, semper contulerunt, omnemque spem in ipsius juventutis corruptela collocarunt. Quocirca nunquam cessant utrumque clerum, ex quo, veluti certissima historiæ monumenta splendide

* S. Leonis Epist. 164, al. 133, § edit. Ball.

† Epist. ad Card. de la Rochefoucault, 10 Martii, 1791.

carefully christian faith and wisdom should avoid this most injurious babbling."

And, since where religion has been removed from civil society, and the doctrine and authority of divine revelation repudiated, the genuine notion itself of justice and human right is darkened and lost, and the place of true justice and legitimate right is supplied by material force, thence it appears why it is that some, utterly neglecting and disregarding the surest principles of sound reason, dare to proclaim that "the people's will, manifested by what is called public opinion or in some other way, constitutes a supreme law, free from all divine and human control; and that in the political order accomplished facts, from the very circumstance that they are accomplished, have the force of right." But who does not see and clearly perceive that human society, when set loose from the bonds of religion and true justice, can have, in truth, no other end than the purpose of obtaining and amassing wealth, and that [society under such circumstances] follows no other law in its actions, except the unchastened desire of ministering to its own pleasures and interests? For this reason men of the kind pursue with bitter hatred the Religious Orders, although these have deserved extremely well of Christendom, civilization, and literature, and cry out that the same have no legitimate reason for being permitted to exist; and thus [these evil men] applaud the calumnies of heretics. For, as Pius VI., Our Predecessor, taught most wisely, "the abolition of regulars is injurious to that state in which the Evangelical counsels are openly professed; it is injurious to a method of life praised in the Church as agreeable to Apostolic doctrine; it is injurious to the illustrious founders themselves, whom we venerate on our altars, who did not establish these societies but by God's inspiration." And [these wretches] also impudently declare that permission should be refused to citizens and to the Church, "whereby they may openly give alms for the sake of Christian charity;" and that the law should be abrogated "whereby on certain fixed days servile works are prohibited because of God's worship;" on the most deceptive pretext that the said permission and law are opposed to the principles of the best public economy. Moreover, not content with removing religion from public society, they wish to banish it also from private families. For teaching and professing the most fatal error of *Communism* and *Socialism*, they assert that domestic society or the family derives the whole principle of its existence from the civil law alone; and, consequently, that from the civil law alone issue, and on it depend, all rights of parents over their children, and especially that of providing for education." By which impious opinions and machinations these most deceitful men chiefly aim at this result, viz., that the salutary teaching and influence of the catholic Church may be entirely banished from the instruction and education of youth, and that the tender and flexible minds of young men may be infected and depraved by every most pernicious error and vice. For all who have endeavoured to throw into confusion things both sacred and secular, and to subvert the right order of society, and to abolish all rights divine and human, have always (as we above hinted) devoted all their nefarious schemes, devices, and efforts, to deceiving and depraving incautious youth and have placed all their hope in its corruption. For which reason they never cease by every wicked method

testantur, tot magna in christianam, civilem, et litterariam rempublicam commoda redundarunt, quibuscumque infandis modis divexare, et edicere, ipsum Clerum "utpote vero, utilique scientiæ et civilitatis progressui inimicum, ab omni juventutis instituendæ educandæque cura et officio esse amovendum."

At vero alii instaurantes prava ac toties damnata novatorum commenta, insigni impudentia audent, Ecclesiæ et hujus Apostolicæ Sedis supremam auctoritatem a Christo Domino ei tributam civilis auctoritatis arbitrio subijcere, et omnia ejusdem Ecclesiæ et Sedis jura denegare circa ea quæ ad exteriorem ordinem pertinent. Namque ipsos minime pudet affirmare "Ecclesiæ leges non obligare in conscientia, nisi cum promulgantur a civili potestate; acta et decreta Romanorum Pontificum ad religionem et Ecclesiam spectantia indigere sanctione et approbatione, vel minimum assensu potestatis civilis; constitutiones Apostolicas,* quibus damnantur clandestinæ societates, sive in eis exigatur, sive non exigatur juramentum de secreto servando, earumque assecræ et fautores anathemate mulcantur, nullam habere vim in illis orbis regionibus ubi ejusmodi aggregationes tolerantur a civili gubernio; excommunicationem a Concilio Tridentino et Romanis Pontificibus latam in eos, qui jura possessionesque Ecclesiæ invadunt et usurpant, niti confusione ordinis spiritualis ordinisque civilis ac politici, ad mundanum duntaxat bonum prosequendum; Ecclesiam nihil debere decernere, quod obstringere possit fidelium conscientias in ordine ad usum rerum temporalium; Ecclesiæ jus non competere violatores legum suarum poenis temporalibus coercendi; conforme esse sacre theologiæ, jurisque publici principiis, bonorum proprietatem, quæ ab Ecclesia, a Familiis religiosis, aliisque locis piis possidentur, civili gubernio asserere et vindicare." Neque erubescunt palam publiceque profiteri hæreticorum effatum et principium, ex quo tot perversæ oriuntur sententiæ, atque errores. Dictitant enim "Ecclesiasticam potestatem non esse jure divino distinctam et independentem a potestate civili, neque ejusmodi distinctionem et independentiam servari posse, quin ab Ecclesia invadantur et usurpentur essentialia jura potestatis civilis." Atque silentio præterire non possumus eorum audaciam, qui sanam non sustinentes doctrinam contendunt "illis Apostolicæ Sedis judiciis, et decretis, quorum objectum ad bonum generale Ecclesiæ, ejusdemque jura, ac disciplinam spectare declaratur, dummodo fidei morumque dogmata non attingat, posse assensum et obedientiam detrectari absque peccato, et absque ulla catholice professionis jactura." Quod quidem quantopere adversetur catholico dogmati plenæ potestatis Romano Pontifici ab ipso Christo Domino divinitus collatæ universalem pascendi, regendi, et gubernandi Ecclesiam, nemo est qui non clare aperteque videat et intelligat.

In tanta igitur depravatarum opinionum perversitate, Nos Apostolici Nostri officii probe memores, ac de sanctissima nostra Religione, de sana doctrina, et animarum salute Nobis divinitus commissa, ac de ipsius humanæ societatis bono maxime solliciti, Apostolicam Nostram vocem iterum extollere existimavimus. Itaque omnes et singulas pravas opiniones ac doctrinas sin-

* Clement XII. "*In eminenti.*" Benedict XIV. "*Providas Romanorum.*" Pii VII. "*Ecclesiam.*" Leonis XII. "*Quo graviora.*"

to assail the clergy, both secular and regular, from whom (as the surest monuments of history conspicuously attest), so many great advantages have abundantly flowed to christianity, civilization, and literature, and to proclaim that "the clergy, as being hostile to the true and beneficial advance of science and civilization, should be removed from the whole charge and duty of instructing and educating youth."

Others meanwhile, reviving the wicked and so often condemned inventions of innovators, dare with signal impudence to subject to the will of the civil authority the supreme authority of the Church and of this Apostolic See given to her by Christ Himself, and to deny all those rights of the same Church and See which concern matters of the external order. For they are not ashamed of affirming "that the Church's laws do not bind in conscience unless when they are promulgated by the civil power; that acts and decrees of the Roman Pontiffs, referring to religion and the Church, need the civil power's sanction and approbation, or at least its consent; that the Apostolic Constitutions, whereby secret societies are condemned (whether an oath of secrecy be or be not required in such societies), and whereby their frequenters and favourers are smitten with anathema—have no force in those regions of the world wherein associations of the kind are tolerated by the civil government; that the excommunication pronounced by the Council of Trent and by Roman Pontiffs against those who assail and usurp the Church's rights and possessions, rests on a confusion between the spiritual and temporal orders, and [is directed] to the pursuit of a purely secular good; that the Church can decree nothing which binds the consciences of the faithful in regard to their use of temporal things; that the Church has no right of restraining by temporal punishments those who violate her laws; that it is conformable to the principles of sacred theology and public law to assert and claim for the civil government a right of property in those goods which are possessed by the Church, by the Religious Orders, and by other pious establishments." Nor do they blush openly and publicly to profess the maxim and principle of heretics from which arise so many perverse opinions and errors. For they repeat that "the ecclesiastical power is not by divine right distinct from, and independent of, the civil power, and that such distinction and independence cannot be preserved without the civil power's essential rights being assailed and usurped by the Church." Nor can we pass over in silence the audacity of those who, not enduring sound doctrine, contend that "without sin and without any sacrifice of the Catholic profession assent and obedience may be refused to those judgments and decrees of the Apostolic See, whose object is declared to concern the Church's general good and her rights and discipline, so only it do not touch the dogmata of faith and morals." But no one can be found not clearly and distinctly to see and understand how grievously this is opposed to the Catholic dogma of the full power given from God by Christ our Lord Himself to the Roman Pontiff of feeding, ruling, and guiding the universal Church.

Amidst, therefore, such great perversity of depraved opinions, We, well remembering Our Apostolic Office, and very greatly solicitous for our most holy Religion, for sound doctrine and the salvation of souls which is intrusted to Us by God, and [solicitous also] for the welfare of human society itself, have thought it right again to raise up Our Apostolic voice. Therefore, by Our

gillatim hisce Litteris commemoratas Auctoritate Nostra Apostolica reprobamus, proscribimus atque damnamus, easque ab omnibus catholica Ecclesia filiis, veluti reprobatas, proscriptas atque damnatas omnino haberi volumus et mandamus.

Ac præter ea, optime scitis, Venerabiles Fratres, hisce temporibus omnis veritatis justitiæque oses, et acerrimos nostræ religionis hostes, per pestiferos libros, libellos, et ephemerides toto terrarum orbe dispersas populis illudentes, ac malitiose mentientes alias impias quasque disseminare doctrinas. Neque ignoratis, hac etiam nostra ætate, nonnullos reperiri, qui Satanæ spiritu permoti et incitati eo impietatis devenerunt, ut Dominatorem Dominum Nostrum Jesum Christum negare, ejusque Divinitatem scelerata procacitate oppugnare non paveant. Hic vero haud possumus, quin maximis meritisque laudibus Vos efferamus, Venerabiles Fratres, qui episcopalem vestram vocem contra tantam impietatem omni zelo attollere minime omisistis.

Itaque hisce Nostris Litteris Vos iterum amantissime alloquimur, qui in sollicitudinis Nostræ partem vocati summo nobis inter maximas Nostras acerbitates solatio, lætitiæ, et consolationi estis propter egregiam, qua præstatis religionem, pietatem, ac propter mirum illum amorem, fidem, et observantiam, qua Nobis et huic Apostolicæ Sedi concordissimis animis obstricti gravissimum episcopale vestrum ministerium strenue ac sedulo implere contenditis. Etenim ab exinio vestro pastoralis zelo expectamus, ut assumentes gladium spiritus, quod est verbum Dei, et confortati in gratia Domini nostri Jesu Christi, velitis ingeminatis studiis quotidie magis prospicere, ut fideles curæ vestræ concrediti "abstineant ab herbis noxiis, quas Jesus Christus non colit, quia non sunt plantatio Patris."* Atque eisdem fidelibus inculcare nunquam desinite, omnem veram felicitatem in homines ex augusta nostra religione, ejusque doctrina et exercitio redundare, ac beatum esse populum, cujus Dominus Deus ejus.† Docete "catholicæ Fidei fundamento regna subsistere,‡ et nihil tam mortiferum, tam præceps ad casum, tam expositum ad omnia pericula, si hoc solum nobis putantes posse sufficere, quod liberum arbitrium, cum nasceremur, accepimus, ultra jam a Domino nihil quaeramus, id est, auctoris nostri obliiti, ejus potentiam, ut nos ostendamus liberos, abjuremus."§ Atque etiam ne omittatis docere "regiam potestatem non ad solum mundi regimen, sed maxime ad Ecclesiæ præsidium esse collatam,|| et nihil esse quod civitatum Principibus, et Regibus majori fructui, gloriæque esse possit, quam si, ut sapientissimus fortissimusque alter Prædecessor Noster S. Felix Zenoni Imperatori præscribat, "Ecclesiam catholicam . . . sinant uti legibus suis, nec libertati ejus quemquam permittant obsistere . . . Certum est enim, hoc rebus suis esse salutare, ut, cum de causis Dei agatur, justa ipsius constitutam regiam voluntatem Sacerdotibus Christi studeant subdere, non præferre."¶

Sed si semper, Venerabiles Fratres, nunc potissimum in tantis Ecclesiæ,

* S. Ignatius M. ad Philadelph. 3.

† Psal. 143.

‡ Cælest. Epist. 22, ad Synod. Ephes. apud Coust., p. 1200.

§ S. Innocent. I. Epist. 29 ad Episc. Conc. Carthag. apud Coust., p. 891.

|| S. Leonis Epist. 156, al. 125.

¶ Pii VII. Epist. Encycl. "*Divi satis*," 15 Maii 1800.

Apostolic Authority we reprobate, proscribe, and condemn all and singular the evil opinions and doctrines severally mentioned in this letter, and will and command that they be thoroughly held by all children of the catholic Church as reprobated, proscribed, and condemned.

And besides these things, You know very well, Venerable Brethren, that in these times the haters of all truth and justice and most bitter enemies of our religion, deceiving the people and maliciously lying, disseminate sundry other impious doctrines by means of pestilential books, pamphlets, and newspapers dispersed over the whole world. Nor are You ignorant, also, that in this our age some men are found who, moved and excited by the spirit of Satan, have reached to that degree of impiety as not to shrink from denying Our Ruler and Lord Jesus Christ, and from impugning his Divinity with wicked pertinacity. Here, however, we cannot but extol You, Venerable Brethren, with great and deserved praise, for not having failed to raise with all zeal your episcopal voice against impiety so great.

Therefore, in this Our Letter, we again most lovingly address You, who, having been called unto a part of Our solicitude, are to us, among Our grievous distresses, the greatest solace, joy, and consolation, because of the admirable religion and piety wherein you excel, and because of that marvellous love, fidelity, and dutifulness, whereby, bound as you are to Us, and to this Apostolic See in most harmonious affection, you strive strenuously and sedulously to fulfil your most weighty episcopal ministry. For from your signal pastoral zeal we expect that, taking up the sword of the spirit which is the word of God, and strengthened in the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, you will, with redoubled care, each day more anxiously provide that the faithful intrusted to your charge "abstain from noxious herbage, which Jesus Christ does not cultivate because it is not His Father's plantation." Never cease also to inculcate on the said faithful that all true felicity flows abundantly upon man from our august Religion and its doctrine and practice; and that happy is the people whose God is their Lord. Teach that "kingdoms rest on the foundation of the catholic Faith; and that nothing is so deadly, so hastening to a fall, so exposed to all danger, [as that which exists] if, believing this alone to be sufficient for us that we received free will at our birth, we seek nothing further from the Lord; that is, if forgetting our Creator we abjure his power that we may display our freedom." And again do not fail to teach "that the royal power was given not only for the governance of the world, but most of all for the protection of the Church;" and that there is nothing which can be of greater advantage and glory to Princes and Kings than if, as another most wise and courageous Predecessor of Ours, St. Felix, instructed the Emperor Zeno, they "permit the catholic Church to practise her laws, and allow no one to oppose her liberty. For it is certain that this mode of conduct is beneficial to their interests, viz, that where there is question concerning the causes of God, they study, according to His appointment, to subject the royal will to Christ's Priests, not to raise it above theirs."

But if always, Venerable Brethren, now most of all amidst such great calamities both of the Church and of civil society, amidst so great a conspiracy against catholic interests and this Apostolic See, and so great a mass

civilisque societatis calamitatibus, in tanta adversariorum contra rem catholicam, et hanc Apostolicam Sedem conspiratione tantaque errorum congerie, necesse omnino est, ut adeamus cum fiducia ad thronum gratiæ, ut misericordiam consequamur, et gratiam inveniamus in auxilio opportuno. Quocirca omnium fidelium pietatem excitare existimavimus, ut una Nobiscum Vobisque clementissimum luminum et misericordiarum Patrem ferventissimis humillimisque precibus sine intermissione orent, et obsecrent, et in plenitudine fidei semper confugiant ad Dominum Nostrum Jesum Christum, qui redemit nos Deo in sanguine suo, Ejusque dulcissimum Cor flagrantissimæ erga nos caritatis victimam enixe jugiterque exorent, ut amoris sui vinculis omnia ad seipsum trahat, utque omnes homines sanctissimo suo amore inflammati secundum Cor Ejus ambulent digne Deo per omnia placentes, in omni bono opere fructificantes. Cum autem sine dubio gratiores sint Deo hominum preces, si animis ab omni labe puris ad ipsum accedant, idcirco cælestes Ecclesiæ thesauros dispensationi Nostræ commissos Christi-fidelibus Apostolica liberalitate reserare censuimus, ut iidem fideles ad veram pietatem vehementius incensi, ac per Pœnitentiæ Sacramentum a peccatorum maculis expiati, fidentius suas preces ad Deum effundant, ejusque misericordiam et gratiam consequantur.

Hiscæ igitur Litteris auctoritate Nostra Apostolica omnibus et singulis utriusque sexus catholici orbis fidelibus Plenariam Indulgentiam ad instar Jubilæi concedimus intra unius tantum mensis spatium usque ad totum futurum annum 1865 et non ultra, a Vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, aliisque legitimis locorum Ordinariis statuendum, eodem prorsus modo et forma qua ab initio supræmi Nostri Pontificatus concessimus per Apostolicas Nostras Litteras in forma Brevis die 20 mensis Novembris anno 1846 datas, et ad universum episcopalem vestrum Ordinem missas, quarum initium "Arcano Divinæ Providentiæ consilio," et cum omnibus eisdem facultatibus, quæ per ipsas Litteras a Nobis datæ fuerunt. Volumus tamen, ut ea omnia serventur, quæ in commemoratis Litteris præscripta sunt, et ea excipiantur, quæ excepta esse declaravimus. Atque id concedimus, non obstantibus in contrarium facientibus quibuscumque, etiam speciali et individua mentione ac derogatione dignis. Ut autem omnis dubitatio et difficultas amoveatur, earumdem Litterarum exemplar ad Vos perferri jussimus.

"Rogemus, Venerabiles Fratres, de intimo corde et de tota mente misericordiam Dei, quia et ipse addidit dicens: Misericordiam autem meam non dispergam ab eis. Petamus et accipiemus, et si accipiendi mora et tarditas fuerit quoniam graviter offendimus, pulsemus, quia et pulsanti aperiatur, si modo pulsent ostium preces, gemitus, et lacrymæ nostræ, quibus insistere et immorari oportet, et si sit unanimis oratio, . . . unusquisque oret Deum non pro se tantum, sed pro omnibus fratribus, sicut Dominus orare nos docuit."* Quo vero facilius Deus Nostris, Vestrisque, et omnium fidelium precibus, votisque annuat, cum omni fiducia deprecatricem apud Eum adhibeamus Immaculatam sanctissimamque Deiparam Virginem Mariam, quæ cunctas hæreses interemit in universo mundo, quæque omnium nostrum amantissima Mater "tota suavis est . . . ac plena

* S. Cyprian. Epist. II.

of errors, it is altogether necessary to approach with confidence the throne of grace, that We may obtain mercy and find grace in timely aid. Wherefore, We have thought it well to excite the piety of all the faithful in order that, together with Us and You, they may unceasingly pray and beseech the most merciful Father of light and pity with most fervent and humble prayers, and in the fulness of faith flee always to Our Lord Jesus Christ, who redeemed us to God in his blood, and earnestly and constantly supplicate His most sweet Heart, the victim of most burning love towards us, that He would draw all things to Himself by the bonds of His love, and that all men inflamed by His most holy love may walk worthily according to His Heart, pleasing God in all things, bearing fruit in every good work. But since without doubt men's prayers are more pleasing to God if they reach Him from minds free of all stain, therefore we have determined to open to Christ's faithful, with Apostolic liberality, the Church's heavenly treasures committed to our charge, in order that the said faithful, being more earnestly enkindled to true piety, and cleansed through the Sacrament of Penance from the defilement of their sins, may with greater confidence pour forth their prayers to God, and obtain His mercy and grace.

By these Letters therefore, in virtue of Our Apostolic authority, we concede to all and singular the faithful of the catholic world, a Plenary Indulgence in form of Jubilee, during the space of one month only for the whole coming year 1865, and not beyond; to be fixed by You, Venerable Brethren, and other legitimate Ordinaries of places, in the very same manner and form in which we granted it at the beginning of Our supreme Pontificate by Our Apostolic Letters in the form of a Brief, dated November 20, 1846, and addressed to all your episcopal Order, beginning, "*Arcano Divinæ Providentiæ consilio*," and with all the same faculties which were given by Us in those Letters. We will, however, that all things be observed which were prescribed in the aforesaid Letters, and those things be excepted which We there so declared. And We grant this, notwithstanding anything whatever to the contrary, even things which are worthy of individual mention and derogation. In order however that all doubt and difficulty be removed, we have commanded a copy of the said Letters to be sent you.

"Let us implore," Venerable Brethren, "God's mercy from our inmost heart and with our whole mind; because He has Himself added, 'I will not remove my mercy from them.' Let us ask and we shall receive; and if there be delay and slowness in our receiving because we have gravely offended, let us knock, because to him that knocketh it shall be opened, if only the door be knocked by our prayers, groans, and tears, in which we must persist and persevere, and if the prayer be unanimous: let each man pray to God, not for himself alone, but for all his brethren, as the Lord hath taught us to pray." But in order that God may the more readily assent to the prayers and desires of Ourselves, of You, and of all the faithful, let us with all confidence employ as our advocate with Him the Immaculate and most holy Virgin Mary, Mother of God, who has slain all heresies throughout the world, and who, the most loving Mother of us all, "is all sweet and full of mercy shows herself to all as easily entreated; shows herself to all as most merciful; pities the necessities of all with a most large

miseriordiæ . . . omnibus sese exorabilem, omnibus clementissimam præbet, omnium necessitates amplissimo quodam miseratur affectu,* atque utpote Regina adstans a dextris Unigeniti Filii Sui Domini Nostri Jesu Christi in vestitu deaurato circumamicta varietate nihil est, quod ab Eo impetrare non valeat. Suffragia quoque petamus Beatissimi Petri Apostolorum Principis, et Coapostoli ejus Pauli, omniumque Sanctorum Cælitum, qui facti jam amici Dei pervenerunt ad cælestia regna, et coronati possident palmam, ac de sua immortalitate securi, de nostra sunt salute solliciti.

Denique cælestium omnium donorum copiam Vobis a Deo ex animo adprecantes, singularis Nostre in Vos caritatis pignus Apostolicam Benedictionem ex intimo corde profectam Vobis ipsis, Venerabiles Fratres, cunctisque Clericis, Laicisque fidelibus curæ vestræ commissis peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romæ apud S. Petrum die VIII. Decembris anno 1864, decimo a Dogmatica Definitione Immaculatæ Conceptionis Deiparæ Virginis Mariæ.

Pontificatus Nostri anno decimonono.

PIUS PP. IX.

SYLLABUS

COMPLECTENS PRÆCIPUOS NOSTRÆ ÆTATIS ERRORES QUI NOTANTUR IN ALLOCUTIONIBUS CONSISTORIALIBUS, IN ENCYCLICIS ALIISQUE APOSTOLICIS LITTERIS SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI PII PAPÆ IX.

§ I.

Pantheismus, Naturalismus et Rationalismus absolutus.

I. Nullum supremum, sapientissimum, providentissimumque Numen divinum existit ab hac rerum universitate distinctum, et Deus idem est ac rerum natura, et iccirco immutationibus obnoxius; Deusque reapse fit in homine et mundo, atque omnia Deus sunt et ipsissimam Dei habent substantiam; ac una eademque res est Deus cum mundo, et proinde spiritus cum materia, necessitas cum libertate, verum cum falso, bonum cum malo, et justum cum injusto.

Alloc. Maxima quidem 9 iunii 1862.

II. Neganda est omnis Dei actio in homines et mundum.

Alloc. Maxima quidem 9 iunii 1862.

III. Humana ratio, nullo prorsus Dei respectu habito, unicus est veri et falsi, boni et mali arbiter, sibi ipsi est lex, et naturalibus suis viribus ad hominum ac populorum bonum curandum sufficit.

Alloc. Maxima quidem 9 iunii 1862.

IV. Omnes religionis veritates ex nativa humanæ rationis vi derivant; hinc ratio est princeps norma qua homo cognitionem omnium ejuscumque generis veritatum assequi possit ac debeat.

Epist. encycl. Qui pluribus 9 novembris 1846.

Epist. encycl. Singulari quidem 17 martii 1856.

Alloc. Maxima quidem 9 iunii 1862.

V. Divina revelatio est imperfecta et iccirco subjecta continuo et indefinito progressui qui humanæ rationis progressioni respondeat.

Epist. encycl. Qui pluribus 9 novembris 1846.

Alloc. Maxima quidem 9 iunii 1862.

* S. Bernard. Serm. de duodecim prærogativis B. M. V. ex verbis Apocalyp.

affection ;" and standing as a Queen at the right hand of her only begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, in gilded clothing, surrounded with variety, can obtain from Him whatever she will. Let us also seek the suffrages of the Most Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and of Paul his Fellow-apostle, and of all the Saints in Heaven, who having now become God's friends, have arrived at the heavenly kingdom, and being crowned bear their palms, and being secure of their own immortality are anxious for our salvation.

Lastly, imploring from Our heart for You from God the abundance of all heavenly gifts, We most lovingly impart the Apostolic Benediction from Our inmost heart, a pledge of our signal love towards You, to Yourselves, Venerable Brethren, and to all the clerics and lay faithful committed to your care.

Given at Rome, from S. Peter's, the 8th day of December, in the year 1864, the tenth from the Dogmatic Definition of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, Mother of God.

In the nineteenth year of Our Pontificate.

SYLLABUS,

EMBRACING THE PRINCIPAL ERRORS OF OUR TIME WHICH ARE CENSURED IN
CONSISTORIAL ALLOCUTIONS, ENCYCLICALS, AND OTHER APOSTOLIC
LETTERS OF OUR MOST HOLY FATHER, POPE PIUS IX.

§ 1.

Pantheism, Naturalism, and absolute Rationalism.

I. There exists no supreme all-wise and most provident divine Being distinct from this universe, and God is the same as the nature of things, and therefore liable to change ; and God is really made both in man and in the world, and all things are God and have the self-same substance of God ; and God is one and the same thing with the world, and therefore spirit is the same thing with matter, necessity with liberty, truth with falsehood, good with evil, and just with unjust.

II. All action of God on mankind and on the world is to be denied.

III. Human reason, without any regard whatever being had to God, is the one judge of truth and falsehood, of good and evil ; it is a law to itself, and suffices by its natural strength for providing the good of men and peoples.

IV. All the truths of religion flow from the natural force of human reason ; hence reason is the chief rule whereby man can and should obtain the knowledge of all truths of every kind.

V. Divine revelation is imperfect, and therefore subject to a continuous and indefinite progress corresponding to the advance of human reason.

VI. Christi fides humanæ refragatur rationi; divinaque revelatio non solum nihil prodest, verum etiam nocet hominis perfectioni.

Epist. encycl. *Qui pluribus* 9 novembris 1846.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem* 9 iunii 1862.

VII. Prophetiæ et miracula in sacris Litteris exposita et narrata sunt poetarum commenta, et christianæ fidei mysteria philosophicarum investigationum summa; et utriusque Testamenti libris mythica continentur inventa; ipseque Jesus Christus est mythica fictio.

Epist. encycl. *Qui pluribus* 9 novembris 1846.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem* 9 iunii 1862.

§ II.

Rationalismus moderatus.

VIII. Quum ratio humana ipsi religioni æquiparetur, iccirco theologicæ disciplinæ perinde ac philosophicæ tractandæ sunt.

Alloc. *Singulari quadam perfusi* 9 decembris 1854.

IX. Omnia indiscriminatum dogmata religionis christianæ sunt objectum naturalis scientiæ seu philosophiæ; et humana ratio historice tantum exulta potest ex suis naturalibus viribus et principiis ad veram de omnibus etiam reconditionibus dogmatibus scientiam pervenire, modo hæc dogmata ipsi rationi tamquam objectum proposita fuerint.

Epist. ad Archiep. Frising. *Gravissimas* 11 decembris 1862.

Epist. ad eundem *Tuas libenter* 21 decembris 1863.

X. Quum aliud sit philosophus, aliud philosophia, ille jus officium habet se submittendi auctoritati, quam veram ipse probaverit; at philosophia neque potest, neque debet ulli sese submittere auctoritati.

Epist. ad Archiep. Frising. *Gravissimas* 11 decembris 1862.

Epist. ad eundem *Tuas libenter* 21 decembris 1863.

XI. Ecclesia non solum non debet in philosophiam unquam animadvertere, verum etiam debet ipsius philosophiæ tolerare errores, eique relinquere ut ipsa se corrigat.

Epist. ad Archiep. Frising. *Gravissimas* 11 decembris 1862.

XII. Apostolicæ Sedis Romanarumque Congregationum decreta liberum scientiæ progressum impediunt.

Epist. ad Archiep. Frising. *Tuas libenter* 21 decembris 1863.

XIII. Methodus et principia, quibus antiqui doctores scholastici Theologiam excoluerunt, temporum nostrorum necessitatibus scientiarumque progressui minime congruunt.

Epist. ad Archiep. Frising. *Tuas libenter* 21 decembris 1863.

XIV. Philosophia tractanda est nulla supernaturalis revelationis habita ratione.

Epist. ad Archiep. Frising. *Tuas libenter* 21 decembris 1863.

N.B. Cum rationalismi systemate coherent maximam partem errores Antonii Günther, qui damnatur in Epist. ad Card. Archiep. Coloniensem *Eximiam tuam*, 15 iunii 1847, et in Epist. ad Episc. Wratislaviensem *Dolore haud mediocri*, 30 aprilis 1860.

§ III.

Indifferentismus, Latitudinarismus.

XV. Liberum cuique homini est eam amplecti ac profiteri religionem, quam rationis lumine quis ductus veram putaverit.

Litt. Apost. *Multiplies inter* 10 iunii 1851.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem* 9 iunii 1862.

VI. The faith of Christ is opposed to human reason ; and divine revelation not only nothing profits, but is even injurious to man's perfection.

VII. The prophecies and miracles recorded and narrated in Scripture are poetical fictions, and the mysteries of christian faith a result of philosophical investigations ; and in the books of both Testaments are contained mythical inventions ; and Jesus Christ himself is a mythical fiction.

§ II.

Moderate Rationalism.

VIII. Since human reason is on a level with religion itself, therefore theological studies are to be handled in the same manner as philosophical.

IX. All the dogmas of the Christian religion are without distinction the object of natural science or philosophy ; and human reason, with no other than an historical cultivation, is able from its own natural strength and principles to arrive at true knowledge of even the more abstruse dogmas, so only these dogmas have been proposed to the reason itself as its object.

X. Since the philosopher is one thing, philosophy another, the former has the right and duty of submitting himself to that authority which he may have approved as true ; but philosophy neither can nor should submit itself to any authority.

XI. The Church not only ought never to animadvert on philosophy, but ought to tolerate the errors of philosophy, and leave it in her hands to correct herself.

XII. The decrees of the Apostolic See and of Roman Congregations interfere with the free progress of science.

XIII. The method and principles whereby the ancient scholastic Doctors cultivated Theology, are not suited to the necessities of our time and to the progress of the sciences.

XIV. Philosophy should be treated without regard had to supernatural revelation.

N.B.—To the system of Rationalism belong mostly the errors of Antony Günther, which are condemned in the epistle to the Cardinal-Archbishop of Cologne : “*Eximiam tuam*,” June 15, 1857, and in that to the Bishop of Breslau, “*Dolore haud mediocri*,” April 30, 1860.

§ III.

Indifferentism, Latitudinarianism.

XV. Every man is free to embrace and profess that religion which, led by the light of reason, he may have thought true.

XVI. Homines in cujusvis religionis cultu viam æternæ salutis reperire æternamque salutem assequi possunt.

Epist. encycl. *Qui pluribus* 9 novembris 1846.

Alloc. *Ubi primum* 17 decembris 1847.

Epist. encycl. *Singulari quidem* 17 martii 1856.

XVII. Saltem bene sperandum est de æterna illorum omnium salute, qui in vera Christi Ecclesia nequaquam versantur.

Alloc. *Singulari quadam* 9 decembris 1854.

Epist. encycl. *Quanto conficiamur* 17 augusti 1863.

XVIII. Protestantismus non aliud est quam diversa ejusdem christianæ religionis forma, in qua æque ac in Ecclesia catholica Deo placere datum est.

Epist. encycl. *Nostis et Nobiscum* 8 decembris 1849.

§ IV.

Socialismus, Communismus, Societates clandestinæ, Societates biblicæ, Societates clerico-liberales.

Ejusmodi pestes sæpe gravissimisque verborum formulis reprobantur in Epist. encycl. *Qui pluribus*, 9 novemb. 1846; in Alloc. *Quibus quantisque*, 20 april. 1849; in Epist. encycl. *Noscitis et Nobiscum*, 8 dec. 1849; in Alloc. *Singulari quadam*, 9 decemb. 1854; in Epist. encycl. *Quanto conficiamur* mærore, 10 augusti 1863.

§ V.

Erroris de Ecclesia ejusque juribus.

XIX. Ecclesia non est vera perfectaue societas plane libera, nec pollet suis propriis et constantibus juribus sibi a divino suo Fundatore collatis, sed civilis potestatis est definire quæ sint Ecclesiæ jura ac limites, intra quos eadem jura exercere queat.

Alloc. *Singulari quadam* 9 decembris 1854.

Alloc. *Multis gravibusque* 17 decembris 1860.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem* 9 junii 1862.

XX. Ecclesiastica potestas suam auctoritatem exercere non debet absque civilis gubernii venia et assensu.

Alloc. *Meminit unusquisque* 30 septembris 1861.

XXI. Ecclesia non habet potestatem dogmatice definiendi, religionem catholicæ Ecclesiæ esse unice veram religionem.

Litt. Apost. *Multiplies inter* 10 junii 1851.

XXII. Obligatio, qua catholici magistri et scriptores omnino adstringuntur, coarctatur in iis tantum, quæ ab infallibili Ecclesiæ judicio veluti fidei dogmata ab omnibus credenda proponuntur.

Epist. ad Archiep. Frising. *Tuas libenter* 21 decembris 1863.

XXIII. Romani Pontifices et Concilia œcumenica a limitibus suæ potestatis recesserunt, jura Principum usurparunt, atque etiam in rebus fidei et morum definiendis errarunt.

Litt. Apost. *Multiplies inter* 10 junii 1851.

XXIV. Ecclesia vis inferendæ potestatem non habet, neque potestatem ullam temporalem directam vel indirectam.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicæ* 22 augusti 1851.

XXV. Præter potestatem episcopatui inhaerentem, alia est attributa temporalis potestas a civili imperio vel expresse vel tacite concessa, revocanda propterea, cum libuerit, a civili imperio.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicæ* 22 augusti 1851.

XVI. Men may in the practice of any religion whatever find the path of eternal salvation, and attain eternal salvation.

XVII. At least good hopes should be entertained concerning the salvation of all those who in no respect live in the true Church of Christ.

XVIII. Protestantism is nothing else than a different form of the same christian religion, in which it is permitted to please God equally as in the true catholic Church.

§ IV.

Socialism, Communism, Secret Societies, Bible Societies, Clerico-Liberal Societies.

Pests of this kind are often reprobated, and in the most severe terms in the Encyclical "Qui pluribus," November 9, 1846; the Allocution "Quibus Quantisque," April 20, 1849; the Encyclical "Noscitis et Nobiscum," December 8, 1849; the Allocution "Singulari quâdam," December 9, 1854; the Encyclical "Quanto conficiamur," August 10, 1863.

§ V.

Errors concerning the Church and her rights.

XIX. The Church is not a true and perfect society fully free, nor does she enjoy her own proper and permanent rights given to her by her divine Founder, but it is the civil power's business to define what are the Church's rights, and the limits within which she may be enabled to exercise them.

XX. The ecclesiastical power should not exercise its authority without permission and assent of the civil government.

XXI. The Church has not the power of dogmatically defining that the religion of the catholic Church is the only true religion.

XXII. The obligation by which catholic teachers and writers are absolutely bound, is confined to those things alone which are propounded by the Church's infallible judgment, as dogmas of faith to be believed by all.

XXIII. Roman Pontiffs and ecumenical Councils have exceeded the limits of their power, usurped the rights of Princes, and erred even in defining matters of faith and morals.

XXIV. The Church has no power of employing force, nor has she any temporal power direct or indirect.

XXV. Besides the inherent power of the episcopate, another temporal power has been granted expressly or tacitly by the civil government, which may therefore be abrogated by the civil government at its pleasure.

XXVI. Ecclesia non habet nativum ac legitimum jus acquirendi ac possidendi.

Alloc. *Nunquam fore* 15 decembris 1856.

Epist. encycl. *Incredibili* 17 septembris 1863.

XXVII. Sacri Ecclesiæ ministri Romanusque Pontifex ab omni rerum temporalium cura ac dominio sunt omnino excludendi.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem* 9 iunii 1862.

XXVIII. Episcopis, sine Gubernii venia, fas non est vel ipsas apostolicas litteras promulgare.

Alloc. *Nunquam fore* 15 decembris 1856.

XXIX. Gratia a Romano Pontifice concessæ existimari debent tamquam irritæ, nisi per Gubernium fuerint imploratæ.

Alloc. *Nunquam fore* 15 decembris 1856.

XXX. Ecclesiæ et personarum ecclesiasticarum immunitas a jure civili ortum habuit.

Litt. Apost. *Multiplices inter* 10 iunii 1851.

XXXI. Ecclesiasticum forum pro temporalibus clericorum causis sive civilibus sive criminalibus omnino de medio tollendum est etiam inconsulta et reclamante Apostolica Sede.

Alloc. *Acerbissimum* 27 septembris 1852.

Alloc. *Nunquam fore* 15 decembris 1856.

XXXII. Absque ulla naturalis juris et æquitatis violatione potest abrogari personalis immunitas, qua clerici ab onere subeundæ exercendæque militiæ eximuntur; hanc vero abrogationem postulat civilis progressus, maxime in societate ad formam liberioris regiminis constituta.

Epist. ad Episc. Montisregal. *Singularis Nobisque* 29 septembris 1864.

XXXIII. Non pertinet unice ad ecclesiasticam jurisdictionis potestatem proprio ac nativo jure dirigere theologicarum rerum doctrinam.

Epist. ad Archiep. Frising. *Tuas libenter* 21 decembris 1863.

XXXIV. Doctrina comparantium Romanum Pontificem Principi libero et agenti in universa Ecclesia, doctrina est quæ medio ævo prævaluit.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicæ* 22 augusti 1851.

XXXV. Nihil vetat, alicujus Concilii generalis sententia aut universorum populorum facto, summum Pontificatum ab Romano Episcopo atque Urbe ad alium Episcopum aliamque civitatem transferri.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicæ* 22 augusti 1851.

XXXVI. Nationalis Concilii definitio nullam aliam admittit disputationem, civilisque administratio rem ad hosce terminos exigere potest.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicæ* 22 augusti 1851.

XXXVII. Institui possunt nationales Ecclesiæ ab auctoritate Romani Pontificis subductæ planeque divisæ.

Alloc. *Multis gravibusque* 17 decembris 1860.

Alloc. *Iamdudum cernimus* 18 martii 1861.

XXXVIII. Divisioni Ecclesiæ in orientalem atque occidentalem nimia Romanorum Pontificum arbitria contulerunt.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicæ* 22 augusti 1851.

XXVI. The Church has no native and legitimate right of acquiring and possessing.

XXVII. The Church's sacred ministers and the Roman Pontiff should be entirely excluded from all charge and dominion of temporal things.

XXVIII. Bishops ought not, without the permission of the Government, to publish even letters apostolic.

XXIX. Graces granted by the Roman Pontiff should be accounted as void, unless they have been sought through the Government.

XXX. The immunity of the Church and of ecclesiastical persons had its origin from the civil law.

XXXI. The ecclesiastical forum for the temporal causes of clerics, whether civil causes or criminal, should be altogether abolished, even without consulting, and against the protest of, the Apostolic See.

XXXII. Without any violation of natural right and equity, that personal immunity may be abrogated, whereby clerics are exempted from the burden of undertaking and performing military services; and such abrogation is required by civil progress, especially in a society constituted on the model of a free rule.

XXXIII. It does not appertain exclusively to ecclesiastical jurisdiction by its own proper and native right to direct the teaching of theology.

XXXIV. The doctrine of those who compare the Roman Pontiff to a Prince, free and acting in the Universal Church, is the doctrine which prevailed in the middle age.

XXXV. Nothing forbids that by the judgment of some general Council, or by the act of all peoples, the supreme Pontificate should be transferred from the Roman Bishop and City to another Bishop and another state.

XXXVI. The definition of a national Council admits no further dispute, and the civil administration may fix the matter on this footing.

XXXVII. National Churches separated and totally disjoined from the Roman Pontiff's authority may be instituted.

XXXVIII. The too arbitrary conduct of Roman Pontiffs contributed to the Church's division into East and West.

§ VI.

*Errores de societate civili tum in se, tum in suis ad Ecclesiam
relationibus spectata.*

XXXIX. Reipublicæ status, utpote omnium jurium origo et fons, jure quodam pollet nullis circumscripto limitibus.

Alloc. Maxima quidem 9 iunii 1862.

XL. Catholicæ Ecclesiæ doctrina humanæ societatis bono et commodo adversatur.

Epist. encycl. Qui pluribus 9 novembris 1846.

Alloc. Quibus quantisque 20 aprilis 1849.

XLI. Civili potestati vel ab infideli imperante exercitæ competit potestas indirecta negativa in sacra; eidem proinde competit nedum jus quod vocant *exequatur*, sed etiam jus *appellationis*, quam nuncupant *ab abusu*.

Litt. Apost. Ad apostolicæ 22 augusti 1851.

XLII. In conflictu legum utriusque potestatis, jus civile prævalet.

Litt. Apost. Ad apostolicæ 22 augusti 1851.

XLIII. Laica potestas auctoritatem habet rescindendi, declarandi ac faciendi irritas solennes conventiones (vulgo *Concordata*) super usu jurium ad ecclesiasticam immunitatem pertinentium cum Sede Apostolica initas, sine hujus consensu, immo et ea reclamamante.

Alloc. In Consistoriali 1 novembris 1850.

Alloc. Multis gravibusque 17 decembris 1860.

XLIV. Civilis auctoritas potest se immiscere rebus quæ ad religionem, mores et regimen spirituale pertinent. Hinc potest de instructionibus judicare, quas Ecclesiæ pastores ad conscientiarum normam pro suo munere edunt, quin etiam potest de divinorum sacramentorum administratione et dispositionibus ad ea suscipienda necessariis decernere.

Alloc. In Consistoriali 1 novembris 1850.

Alloc. Maxima quidem 9 iunii 1862.

XLV. Totum scholarum publicarum regimen, in quibus juvenus christianæ alicujus Reipublicæ instituitur, episcopalibus duntaxat seminariis aliqua ratione exceptis, potest ac debet attribui auctoritati civili, et ita quidem attribui, ut nullum alii cuicumque auctoritati recognoscatur jus immiscendi se in disciplina scholarum, in regimine studiorum, in graduum collatione, in delectu aut approbatione magistrorum.

Alloc. In Consistoriali 1 novembris 1850.

Alloc. Quibus luctuosissimis 5 septembris 1851.

XLVI. Immo in ipsis clericorum seminariis methodus studiorum adhibenda civili auctoritati subjicitur.

Alloc. Nunquam fore 15 decembris 1856.

XLVII. Postulat optima civilis societatis ratio, ut populares scholæ, quæ patent omnibus cujusque ab populo classis pueris, ac publica universim Instituta, quæ litteris severioribusque disciplinis tradendis et educationi juventutis curandæ sunt destinata, eximantur ab omni Ecclesiæ auctoritate, moderatrice vi et ingerentia, plenoque civilis ac politicæ auctoritatis arbitrio subjiciantur, ad imperantium placita et ad communium ætatis opinionum amussim.

Epist. ad Archiep. Friburg. Quum non sine 14 iulii 1864.

§. VI.

Errors concerning civil society, considered both in itself and in its relations to the Church.

XXXIX. The State, as being the origin and fountain of all rights, possesses a certain right of its own, circumscribed by no limits.

XL. The doctrine of the Catholic Church is opposed to the good and benefit of human society.

XLI. The civil power, even when exercised by a non-Catholic ruler, has an indirect negative power over things sacred; it has consequently not only the right which they call *exequatur*, but that right also which they call *appel comme d'abus*.

XLII. In the case of a conflict between laws of the two powers, civil law prevails.

XLIII. The lay power has the authority of rescinding, of declaring null, and of voiding solemn conventions (commonly called Concordats), concerning the exercise of rights appertaining to ecclesiastical immunity, which have been entered into with the Apostolic See,—without this See's consent, and even against its protest.

XLIV. The civil authority may mix itself up in matters which appertain to religion, morals, and spiritual rule. Hence it can exercise judgment concerning those instructions which the Church's pastors issue according to their office for the guidance of consciences; nay, it may even decree concerning the administration of the holy sacraments, and concerning the dispositions necessary for their reception.

XLV. The whole governance of public schools wherein the youth of any christian State is educated, episcopal seminaries only being in some degree excepted, may and should be given to the civil power; and in such sense be given, that no right be recognized in any other authority of mixing itself up in the management of the schools, the direction of studies, the conferring of degrees, the choice or approbation of teachers.

XLVI. Nay, in the very ecclesiastical seminaries, the method of study to be adopted is subject to the civil authority.

XLVII. The best constitution of civil society requires that popular schools which are open to children of every class, and that public institutions generally which are devoted to teaching literature and science and providing for the education of youth, be exempted from all authority of the Church, from all her moderating influence and interference, and subjected to the absolute will of the civil and political authority [so as to be conducted] in accordance with the tenets of civil rulers, and the standard of the common opinions of the age.

XLVIII. Catholicis viris probari potest ea juventutis instituendæ ratio, quæ sit a catholica fide et ab Ecclesiæ potestate sejuncta, quæque rerum dumtaxat naturalium scientiam ac terrenæ socialis vitæ fines tantum modo vel saltem primarium spectet.

Epist. ad Archiep. Friburg. *Quum non sine* 14 iulii 1864.

XLIX. Civilis auctoritas potest impedire quominus sacrorum Antistites et fideles populi cum Romano Pontifice libere ac mutuo communicent.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem* 9 iunii 1862.

L. Laica auctoritas habet per se jus præsentandi Episcopos, et potest ab illis exigere ut ineant diocesium procurationem, antequam ipsi canonicam a S. Sede institutionem et apostolicas litteras accipiant.

Alloc. *Nunquam fore* 15 decembris 1856.

LI. Immo laicum gubernium habet jus deponendi ab exercitio pastoralis ministerii Episcopos, neque tenetur obedire Romano Pontifici in iis quæ episcopatum et Episcoporum respiciunt institutionem.

Litt. Apost. *Multiplices inter* 10 iunii 1851.

Alloc. *Acerbissimum* 27 septembris 1852.

LII. Gubernium potest suo jure immutare ætatem ab Ecclesia præscriptam pro religiosa tam mulierum quam virorum professione, omnibusque religiosis familiis indicere, ut neminem sine suo permissu ad solemnia vota nuncupanda admittant.

Alloc. *Nunquam fore* 15 decembris 1856.

LIII. Abrogandæ sunt leges quæ ad religiosarum familiarum statum tutandum, earumque jura et officia pertinent; immo potest civile gubernium iis omnibus auxilium præstare, qui a suscepto religiosæ vitæ instituto deficere ac solemnia vota frangere velint; pariterque potest religiosas easdem familias perinde ac collegiatis Ecclesias et beneficia simplicia etiam juris patronatus penitus extinguere, illorumque bona et redditus civilis potestatis administrationi et arbitrio subjicere et vindicare.

Alloc. *Acerbissimum* 27 septembris 1852.

Alloc. *Probe meminertis* 22 ianuarii 1855.

Alloc. *Cum sæpe* 26 iulii 1855.

LIV. Reges et Principes non solum ab Ecclesiæ jurisdictione eximuntur, verum etiam in quæstionibus jurisdictionis dirimendis superiores sunt Ecclesiæ.

Litt. Apost. *Multiplices inter* 10 iunii 1851.

LV. Ecclesia a Statu, Statusque ab Ecclesia sejungendus est.

Alloc. *Acerbissimum* 27 septembris 1852.

§ VII.

Errores de Ethica naturali et Christiana.

LVI. Morum leges divina haud egent sanctione, minimeque opus est ut humanæ leges ad naturæ jus conformentur aut obligandi vim a Deo accipiant.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem* 9 iunii 1862.

LVII. Philosophicarum rerum morumque scientia, itemque civiles leges possunt et debent a divina et ecclesiastica auctoritate declinare.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem* 9 iunii 1862.

XLVIII. That method of instructing youth can be approved by Catholic men, which is disjoined from the catholic faith and the Church's power, and which regards exclusively, or at least principally, knowledge of the natural order alone, and the ends of social life on earth.

XLIX. The civil authority may prevent the Bishops and faithful from free and mutual communication with the Roman Pontiff.

L. The lay authority has of itself the right of presenting bishops, and may require of them that they enter on the management of their dioceses before they receive from the Holy See canonical institution and apostolical letters.

LI. Nay, the lay government has the right of deposing bishops from exercise of their pastoral ministry; nor is it bound to obey the Roman Pontiff in those things which regard the establishment of bishoprics and the appointment of bishops.

LII. The government may, in its own right, change the age prescribed by the Church for the religious profession of men and women, and may require religious orders to admit no one to solemn vows without its permission.

LIII. Those laws should be abrogated which relate to protecting the condition of religious orders and their rights and duties; nay, the civil government may give assistance to all those who may wish to quit the religious life which they have undertaken, and to break their solemn vows; and in like manner it may altogether abolish the said religious orders, and also collegiate churches and simple benefices, even those under the right of a patron, and subject and assign their goods and revenues to the administration and free disposal of the civil power.

LIV. Kings and Princes are not only exempted from the Church's jurisdiction, but also are superior to the Church in deciding questions of jurisdiction.

LV. The Church should be separated from the State, and the State from the Church.

§ VII.

Errors concerning natural and Christian Ethics.

LVI. The laws of morality need no Divine sanction, and there is no necessity that human laws be conformed to the law of nature, or receive from God their obligatory force.

LVII. The science of philosophy and morals, and also the laws of a state, may and should withdraw themselves from the jurisdiction of Divine and ecclesiastical authority.

LVIII. Aliæ vires non sunt agnoscendæ nisi illæ quæ in materia positæ sunt, et omnis morum disciplina honestasque collocari debet in cumulandis et augendis quovis modo divitiis ac in voluptatibus explendis.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem* 9 iunii 1862.

Epist. encycl. *Quanto conficiamur* 10 augusti 1863.

LIX. Jus in materiali facto consistit, et omnia hominum officia sunt nomen inane, et omnia humana facta juris vim habent.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem* 9 iunii 1862.

LX. Auctoritas nihil aliud est nisi numeri et materialium virium summa.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem* 9 iunii 1862.

LXI. Fortunata facti injustitia nullum juris sanctitati detrimentum affert.

Alloc. *Iamdudum cernimus* 18 martii 1861.

LXII. Proclamandum est et observandum principium quod vocant de *non interventu*.

Alloc. *Novos et ante* 28 septembris 1860.

LXIII. Legitimis principibus obedientiam detrectare, immo et rebellare licet.

Epist. encycl. *Qui pluribus* 9 novembris 1846.

Alloc. *Quisque vestrum* 4 octobris 1847.

Epist. encycl. *Nostis et Nobiscum* 8 decembris 1849.

Litt. Apost. *Cum catholica* 26 martii 1860.

LXIV. Tum cujusque sanctissimi juramenti violatio, tum quælibet scelestæ flagitiosæque actio sempiternæ legi repugnans, non solum haud est improbanda, verum etiam omnino licita, summisque laudibus efferenda, quando id pro patriæ amore agatur.

Alloc. *Quibus quantisque* 20 aprilis 1849.

§ VIII.

Errores de Matrimonio Christiano.

LXV. Nulla ratione ferri potest, Christum evexisse matrimonium ad dignitatem sacramenti.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicæ* 22 augusti 1851.

LXVI. Matrimonii sacramentum non est nisi contractui accessorium ab eoque separabile, ipsumque sacramentum in una tantum nuptiali benedictione situm est.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicæ* 23 augusti 1851.

LXVII. Jure naturæ matrimonii vinculum non est indissolubile, et in variis casibus divortium proprie dictum auctoritate civili sanciri potest.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicæ* 22 augusti 1851.

Alloc. *Acerbissimum* 27 septembris 1852.

LXVIII. Ecclesia non habet potestatem impedimenta matrimonium dirimentia inducendi, sed ea potestas civili auctoritati competit, a qua impedimenta existentia tollenda sunt.

Litt. Apost. *Multiplices inter* 10 iunii 1851.

LXIX. Ecclesia sequioribus sæculis dirimentia impedimenta inducere cepit, non jure proprio, sed illo jure usa, quod a civili potestate mutuata erat.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicæ* 22 augusti 1851.

LVIII. No other strength is to be recognized except material force; and all moral discipline and virtue should be accounted to consist in accumulating and increasing wealth by every method, and in satiating the desire of pleasure.

LIX. Right consists in the mere material fact; and all the duties of man are an empty name, and all human facts have the force of right.

LX. Authority is nothing else but numerical power and material force.

LXI. The successful injustice of a fact brings with it no detriment to the sanctity of right.

LXII. The principle of non-intervention (as it is called) should be proclaimed and observed.

LXIII. It is lawful to refuse obedience to legitimate princes, and even rebel against them.

LXIV. A violation of any most sacred oath, or any wicked and flagitious action whatever repugnant to the eternal law, is not only not to be reprobated, but is even altogether lawful, and to be extolled with the highest praise when it is done for love of country.

§ VIII.

Errors concerning Christian Matrimony.

LXV. It can in no way be tolerated that Christ raised matrimony to the dignity of a sacrament.

LXVI. The sacrament of marriage is only an accessory to the contract, and separable from it; and the sacrament itself consists in the nuptial benediction alone.

LXVII. The bond of matrimony is not indissoluble by the law of nature; and in various cases divorce, properly so called, may be sanctioned by the civil authority.

LXVIII. The Church has no power of enacting diriment impediments to marriage; but that power is vested in the civil authority, by which the existing impediments may be removed.

LXIX. In later ages the Church began to enact diriment impediments not in her own right, but through that right which she had borrowed from the civil power.

LXX. Tridentini canones qui anathematis censuram illis inferunt qui facultate impedimenta dirimentia inducendi Ecclesiae negare audeant, vel non sunt dogmatici vel de hac mutuata potestate intelligendi sunt.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicæ* 22 augusti 1851.

LXXI. Tridentini forma sub infirmitatis pœna non obligat, ubi lex civilis aliam formam præstituat, et velit ac nova forma interveniente matrimonium valere.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicæ* 22 augusti 1851.

LXXII. Bonifacius VIII. votum castitatis in ordinatione emissum nuptias nullas reddere primus asseruit.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicæ* 22 augusti 1851.

LXXIII. Vi contractus mere civilis potest inter christianos constare veri nominis matrimonium; falsumque est, aut contractum matrimonii inter christianos semper esse sacramentum, aut nullum esse contractum, si sacramentum excludatur.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicæ* 22 augusti 1851.

Lettera di S. S. Pio IX al Re di Sardegna, 9 settembre 1852.

Alloc. *Acerbissimum* 27 septembris 1852.

Alloc. *Multis gravibusque* 17 decembris 1860.

LXXIV. Causæ matrimoniales et sponsalia suapte natura ad forum civile pertinent.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicæ* 22 augusti 1851.

Alloc. *Acerbissimum* 27 septembris 1852.

N.B.—Huc facere possunt duo alii errores: de clericorum cœlibatu abolendo et de statu matrimonii statui virginittatis antefereendo. Confodiuntur, prior in Epist. Encycl. *Qui pluribus*, 9 Novembris 1846, posterior in Litteris Apost. *Multiplies inter*, 10 Junii 1851.

§ IX.

Erroris de civili Romani Pontificis Principatu.

LXXV. De temporalis regni cum spirituali compatibilitate disputant inter se christianæ et catholicæ Ecclesiæ filii.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicæ* 22 augusti 1851.

LXXVI. Abrogatio civilis imperii, quo Apostolica Sedes potitur, ad Ecclesiæ libertatem felicitatemque vel maxime conduceret.

Alloc. *Quibus quantisque* 20 aprilis 1849.

N.B.—Præter hos errores explicite notatos, alii complures implicite reprobantur proposita et asserta doctrina, quam catholici omnes firmissime retinere debeant, de civili Romani Pontificis principatu. Ejusmodi doctrina luculenter traditur in Alloc. *Quibus quantisque*, 20 April. 1849; in Alloc. *Si semper antea*, 20 Maii 1850; in Litt. Apost. *Cum catholica Ecclesia*, 26 Mart. 1860; in Alloc. *Novos*, 28 Sept. 1860; in Alloc. *Jamdudum*, 18 Mart. 1861; in Alloc. *Maxima quidem*, 9 Junii 1862.

§ X.

Erroris qui ad Liberalissimum hodiernum referuntur.

LXXVII. Ætate hac nostra non amplius expedit religionem catholicam haberi tanquam unicam status religionem, ceteris quibuscumque cultibus exclusis.

Alloc. *Nemo vestrum* 26 iulii 1855.

LXX. The Canons of Trent, which inflict the censure of anathema on those who dare to deny the Church's power of enacting diriment impediments, are either not dogmatical, or are to be understood of this borrowed power.

LXXI. The form ordained by the Council of Trent does not bind on pain of nullity wherever the civil law may prescribe another form, and may will that, by this new form, matrimony shall be made valid.

LXXII. Boniface VIII. was the first who asserted that the vow of chastity made at ordination annuls marriage.

LXXIII. By virtue of a purely civil contract there may exist among Christians marriage, truly so called; and it is false that either the contract of marriage among Christians is always a sacrament, or that there is no contract if the sacrament be excluded.

LXXIV. Matrimonial causes and espousals belong by their own nature to the civil forum.

N.B.—To this head may be referred two other errors: on abolishing clerical celibacy, and on preferring the state of marriage to that of virginity. They are condemned, the former in the Encyclical "*Qui pluribus*," Nov. 9, 1846; the latter in the Apostolic Letters, "*Multiplies inter*," June 10, 1851.

§ IX.

Errors concerning the Roman Pontiff's civil principedom.

LXXV. Children of the christian and catholic Church dispute with each other on the compatibility of the temporal rule with the spiritual.

LXXVI. The abrogation of that civil power, which the Apostolic See possesses, would conduce in the highest degree to the Church's liberty and felicity.

N.B.—Besides these errors explicitly branded, many others are implicitly reprobated in the exposition and assertion of that doctrine which all Catholics ought most firmly to hold concerning the Roman Pontiff's civil principedom. This doctrine is clearly delivered in the Allocution, "*Quibus quantisque*," April 20, 1849; in the Allocution, "*Si semper antea*," May 20, 1850; in the Apostolic Letters, "*Cum Catholica Ecclesia*," March 26, 1860; in the Allocution, "*Novos*," Sept. 28, 1861; in the Allocution "*Jamdudum*," March 18, 1861; in the Allocution, "*Maxima quidem*," June 9, 1862.

§ X.

Errors which have reference to the Liberalism of the day.

LXXVII. In this our age it is no longer expedient that the catholic religion should be treated as the only religion of the State, all other worships whatsoever being excluded.

LXXVIII. Hinc laudabiliter in quibusdam catholici nominis regionibus lege cautum est, ut hominibus illuc immigrantibus liceat publicum proprii cujusque cultus exercitium habere.

Alloc. Acerbissimum 27 septembris 1852.

LXXIX. Enimvero falsum est, civilem cujusque cultus libertatem, itemque plenam potestatem omnibus attributam quaslibet opiniones cogitationesque palam publice manifestandi, conducere ad populorum mores animosque facilius corrumpendos, ac indifferentismi pestem propagandam.

Alloc. Nunquam fore 15 decembris 1856.

LXXX. Romanus Pontifex potest ac debet cum progressu, cum liberalismo et cum recenti civilitate sese reconciliare et componere.

Alloc. Iamdudum cernimus 18 martii 1861.

LXXVIII. Hence it has been laudably provided by law in some catholic countries, that men thither immigrating should be permitted the public exercise of their own several worships.

LXXIX. For truly it is false that the civil liberty of all worships, and the full power granted to all of openly and publicly declaring any opinions or thoughts whatever, conduces to more easily corrupting the morals and minds of peoples and propagating the plague of indifferentism.

LXXX. The Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile and harmonize himself with progress, with liberalism, and with modern civilization.

Notices of Books.

Essays on Religion and Literature, by various writers. Edited by H. E. MANNING, D.D. London: Longman. 1865.

ESSAYS are now, it seems, the recognized instruments by which men who have something to say, and but little time to say it in, invite the attention of the world. The opportunity, therefore, appears to have come for us Catholics to raise our voice, and, at least, warn the outer world, that we have an opinion of our own upon the momentous questions which so many people think they can decide without much trouble. There are people, not without sense on the whole, who have persuaded themselves that on certain subjects there is nothing to be said beyond or against that view of them which they have themselves adopted. It is not easy to obtain a hearing from these people, but still it must be our duty to try them, and if we fail, there need be nothing more said. The *Essays* before us are the fruits of the association which the late Cardinal Archbishop—on whose soul God have mercy—founded a few years ago, and which, judging by what we see, has been eminently prosperous. Monsignore Manning, the Provost of Westminster, is the editor, and also one of the contributors; we have, therefore, every guarantee for sound principle and honourable efficiency.

His Eminence contributed two essays: the "Inaugural Discourse," and another of great interest, "On the Truths of supposed Legends and Fables." The history of S. Ursula and her companions, over which heretics have made merry, and timid Christians looked puzzled, is here brought before us in a most clear and convincing manner, told, as the Cardinal alone could tell it, concisely and even picturesquely. We are glad to have it in print, not only for its intrinsic merits, but because it will serve to encourage others to tread in the same way, and to stand out manfully for the old traditions. The learned Dom. Guéranger, in France, did a like service, by his defence of the story of Constantine's baptism. The venerable abbot defends the account in the Breviary, and makes light of the Greek stories which hand over the first Christian emperor to the army of the Arians.

The Cardinal, in addition to the story of S. Ursula, relates the history of our Lady's tunic, and of the head of S. John Baptist: two relics hitherto objects of derision, and sometimes, where it ought not to be so, of suspicion.

Monsignore Manning's essay treats of the subjects proper for discussion by the learned and accomplished members of the association or academia of the Catholic religion, and is written with his usual fearlessness and sincerity. It may be regarded as the preface to all future collections of essays, as the Cardinal's discourse is the exponent of the whole society viewed as an

assembly of scientific men, observing the phenomena of the day, and appreciating them at their proper worth.

The next in order is that of the earnest archaeologist, Dr. Rock, Canon of Southwark, who speaks to us fresh from his meditations in the school of Durandus, with understanding exercised on the learning of the ancient architects and sculptors, who are said to have had a meaning in every line of their work. He discourses here on the "golden frontal at Milan," on the many lessons it contains, and on the significance of the artistic work. An Anglo-Saxon goldsmith was the cunning artificer, who wrought that magnificent testimony to the skill of mediæval artists, and the learned canon is justly proud, not only of his countryman, but also of the scientific heed which consigned "the liturgical teachings" to so durable a material. But we have a quarrel with the Canon, who has taken an unfair advantage of us. He leads us into "the Ambrosian Basilica, set out in true orientation," and tells the history of great deeds. He writes thus: "While standing on the threshold of this hallowed building, we cannot help speaking of those two great saints and doctors of the Church who so often trod its pavement." The saints are SS. Ambrose and Augustine. He then describes the excommunication of the Emperor Theodosius by the former, and the conversion and baptism of the latter, and concludes his eloquent story with the following words:—"The Ambrosian Basilica could not have been the scene of these two thrilling events."

In the course of his dissertation, the learned archaeologist tells us two stories of the ignorance of people who meddle with the subject of which he is so profound a master: one relates to certain golden crowns discovered in Spain, and which antiquarians pronounced to be the crowns of the ancient sovereigns of Spain—in short, of its Gothic kings. They were not secular crowns at all, and Dr. Rock says, "I was the first individual to deny that these Spanish crowns were royal ones at all;" and then with a little grave but gentle irony, adds: "This shows how the knowledge of ecclesiastical antiquities may sometimes stand in useful stead, even to those who are, or are likely to be, employed in diplomacy."

The other story is more amusing. The first Buonaparte wanted to have something which had belonged to Charlemagne employed at his coronation. A silver-gilt wand was discovered of respectable antiquity, and this served as a sceptre, and was treated as Charlemagne's own; but it was in fact nothing more and nothing less than the Castor's wand of S. Denys, which was used at the more solemn offices. It had been made in 1394, nearly six hundred years after the great emperor had been laid in his grave.

The next discourse is a most able and ingenious dissertation, on the birthplace of S. Patrick, by Mr. Cashel Hoey, who assigns a French *domicilium originis* to the great confessor, who made Christians of the pagan inhabitants of Ireland. Mr. Hoey undertakes to perfect the proof, which Dr. Lanigan commenced, that S. Patrick was born on the coast of Armorica Gaul; and that the Irish tradition which assigns France as the birthplace of the saint is the true one, to the exclusion of the most generally accepted theory, and that which has the greatest weight of authority in its favour; viz, that he was born in Scotland, at Dumbarton, on the Clyde. This latter theory has

been upheld by all the Scotch antiquarians, by Colgan, by the Bollandists, and accepted by Dr. John O'Donovan, by Professor Eugene O'Curry, by Dr. Reeves, and by Dr. Todd. But we think that no one will rise from a perusal of Mr. Hoey's extremely able and ingenious, but painstaking and candid essay, without feeling satisfied that he has fully succeeded in displacing their conjectures and in proving his own case.

The original documents which bear on the point are two, the confession of S. Patrick himself, and the hymn in his honour composed by his disciple S. Fiech. There are four localities mentioned in these documents. In the Confession, S. Patrick says: "Patrem habui Calpurnium Diaconum (or Diacurionem), qui fuit e vico Bonaven Tabernæ. Villam Enon prope habuit, ubi ego in capturam decidi." S. Fiech's hymn adds, that the saint was born at a place called Nem-tur. These localities occur in all the ancient lives of S. Patrick, and the questions are in what country were they situate, can they be identified, and is Mr. Hoey right in thinking that he has found them all in the neighbourhood of Boulogne-sur-Mer? All these questions must be answered in the affirmative—accepting Dr. Lanigan's identification of Bonaven with Boulogne-sur-Mur, but rejecting the rest of his proof as utterly untenable. Mr. Hoey shows, as to the word Enon, that the river Liane, which flows into the sea at Boulogne, was known to the Romans as *Fluvius Enna*. As to Nem-tur, Professor Eugene O'Curry had already discovered by personal inspection of the oldest MSS. that the word should really be written *Em-tur*, and that the *N* was but a prefix introduced to fill the hiatus in the text. *Em-tur* means the tower of some place or person, indicated by the word *Em*. Now the river *Em* or *Hem*, some eight miles from Desvres, flows past the village in which Julius Cæsar slept on his way to embark for England. The name of that village is Tournehem; or as it was written in Malbranq's time *Tur-n-hem* (the tower of Hem). *Em-tur*, then, is the same compound word, and the apparent difference is only a transposition to suit the exigencies of Irish verse. There remains *Tabernæ*. Mr. Hoey finds it at Desvres. The Roman camps in Gaul were called *Tabernæ*. The country between Desvres and Boulogne was a great Roman encampment. In the Latin of the Middle Ages Desvres was called *Divernia Bononiensis*. The change from *Taberna* to *Taverna* is familiarized to us in our own taverns, and the convertibility of *T* and *D* needs no illustration. In this *Divernia Bononiensis*, then, Mr. Hoey finds the *Tabernæ Bononienses*, in *Tournehem* he finds *Nemtur* or *Emtur*, and in *Enna* he finds *Enon*. He confirms his theory by various collateral evidences, but we have only given the merest outline of his argument, and refer our readers to the essay itself, which is one of the most interesting contributions to the *Academia* papers.

That elegant and accomplished scholar, the Canon Oakeley, has written too briefly on the position of a Catholic minority, but what he has written is singularly to the purpose, and is the more valuable, because it comes from one whose intellectual culture is so refined; for in general the literary habit is fatal to that energy of purpose and sincerity of deep conviction which is so transparent in the discourse before us. The Canon calls the attention of Catholics to the pernicious habit "of understatement of Catholic truth," and points out the danger of people who prefer

"liberal Protestants" to "bigots." The thesis of Mr. Oakeley is a very grave one, and perhaps in former times it was necessary to employ an inadequate phraseology, and to hide Catholic rites under the guise of heretical ceremonies; but it is not necessary now; and we agree with the Canon that we need not and ought not to call ourselves our "co-religionists." Neither is there any reason why we should put ourselves in a position where the Catholic Church shall be called a "denomination," and the Catholic faith a "persuasion." The Canon has done a real service by calling our attention to this point, and we can do nothing better while taking leave of him than by quoting from Simancas, Bishop of Badajoz, the following words:—*Nec ferendi quidem qui . . . "persuasione" pro "fide" abutuntur. Quis enim est qui non plane perspicat longe aliud esse Catholicam fidem quam persuasuram.*—De Cath. Institut. tit. 31, n. 31.

The remaining essays are by Mr. Laing and Mr. Lucas. The latter gentleman has handled with great care and ability a subject which is vitally momentous at this time, and on which we hope at no very distant period to write at length. We shall then have an opportunity of treating in detail Mr. Lucas's very valuable labours.

Acta SS. D. N. Pii PP. IX. ex quibus excerptus est Syllabus. Romæ. 1865.

Recueil des Allocutions Consistoriales, Encycliques, &c., citées dans l'Encyclique et le Syllabus. Paris : Le Clerc. London : Burns. 1865.

Les Actes Pontificaux cités dans l'Encyclique du 8 Déc. Paris : Poussielque. London : Burns.

IT will probably be several years before any adequate impression is obtained, of the multifarious benefits which will flow from the Encyclical and Syllabus. Here is a firstfruit of their publication; for in each of the three volumes is comprised the whole assemblage of those Papal declarations which the Syllabus specifies. That the volumes will have a large circulation cannot be doubted; and these declarations, therefore, will be known very far more widely, and studied very far more carefully, by the educated Catholic world than has hitherto been the case. The happy result of this must be a far more enlarged and elevated perception of Catholic truth, and a far keener refinement of Catholic instinct. Then, again, Catholics will thus be led more earnestly to inquire what is the real authority of such pronouncements; and whenever this inquiry is undertaken in a straightforward and docile spirit, we have no doubt whatever of its result. Many educated English Catholics, *e. g.*, have hitherto not recognized the infallibility of such Papal declarations, simply because they have thought so little about the matter.

The first of these volumes is published in Rome; and it contains the text of the Syllabus, together with that of all the Papal declarations therein specified, arranged in chronological order. We have been a little surprised that the "*Quantâ Curâ*" itself is not included; for the result is that all Pius IX.'s more important pronouncements are here to be found, except that which in some respects is more remarkable than any other. We

think it would be a manifest convenience to possess both Encyclical and Syllabus in the same book.

The second of the volumes above cited came out in Paris. It contains—(1) The Encyclical as well as Syllabus; (2) Pius IX.'s Apostolic Letter proclaiming the former jubilee; (3) Those various declarations of previous Pontiffs to which the Encyclical refers; (4) Those pronouncements of Pius IX. which are specified in the Syllabus, arranged in chronological order; (5) The address to Pius IX. from the Catholic bishops assembled in Rome on June 9, 1862; (6) Certain documents connected with the French Concordat of 1801; and (7) a catalogue of unsound propositions, drawn up in 1863 and submitted to Rome, on which the recent Syllabus appears to be founded in no inconsiderable degree. It should be added that there is a French translation throughout on the opposite page, and that the whole, considering its extent, is offered for a marvellously low sum. The last of the three is almost identical with the second in its contents. It does not, however, comprise the propositions of 1863.

We most heartily recommend all three volumes to the Catholic's careful study.

La Convention du 15 Septembre, et l'Encyclique du 8 Décembre. Par Mgr. L'ÉVÊQUE D'ORLÉANS, de l'Académie Française. Paris: Douniol.

WHEN the French Imperial Minister of Justice and Public Worship, on the 3rd of January last, issued his edict forbidding the French bishops to promulgate the Encyclical *Quantà Curâ*, on the score that it contained doctrine hostile to the liberties of the Gallican Church, he did not foresee that he was taking the one single step which was sure to end in the Gallican maxims themselves adding their whole weight to the cause which he disliked. The act of the Minister was so arbitrary and so wanton, that it forced the Episcopacy of France to speak out in protest against the Government and in defence of the Papacy, in a way to which no other National Church has been provoked. The tacit assent of the hierarchies of other countries has, no doubt, been unhesitatingly given to Encyclical and Syllabus. But by a benevolent dispensation of Providence, the French Government has, as it were, compelled the French bishops, to give their eager, explicit, and unambiguous adhesion to every proposition laid down in either document; and in a series of pastorals of unprecedented unanimity, zeal, and ability, to justify its doctrine to their flocks.

Of this grand series of documents, which for weeks together, day after day, occupied all the spare space of the French journals, the pamphlet of the Bishop of Orleans created by far the greatest sensation in the exterior world. In truth, even in these days, when the *brochure* is the most powerful engine of public opinion in France, no *brochure* has told so powerfully as this: none can be even compared to it, in the extent and intensity of public interest excited, except the pamphlets ascribed to the Emperor's own inspiration at the beginning and end of the last Italian war,—“*Napoléon III. et l'Italie*,” and “*Le Pape et le Congrès*.” But the circulation of both these together

was hardly equal to that of Mgr. Dupanloup's pamphlet on the Convention and Encyclical. It has gone through twenty-five editions. For weeks together it occupied five printing-presses day and night. The publisher is said to have cleared 500*l.* within a week of the date of publication ; and it contains 160 octavo pages, and was published at two francs. It has been translated into the principal languages of Europe ; we even see a Flemish translation of it announced in the last number of the *Revue Catholique* of Louvain.

This immense popularity is in part doubtless due to the very original attitude assumed and throughout maintained with such consummate spirit, eloquence, and dignity by the Bishop. "You forbid me," he says, "to write a pastoral : then I will write a pamphlet. You strive to seal my lips as a bishop ; but you cannot bind my hands as a citizen. I have at least the same right before public opinion as the journalists who traduce and travesty the acts of the Father of the Faithful. About the Convention I will ask questions. About the Encyclical I will give answers. As a French citizen, I am not yet accustomed to comprehend the force of a law or a solemn treaty before it has been explained to me by a public discussion between the Government and the representatives of the country. As a Catholic Bishop, I am not yet accustomed to see an Encyclical of the Pope interpreted by a council of journalists."

The first part of this pamphlet, if it stood alone, might fairly be pronounced to be the ablest discussion of the whole case involved in the relations between the Governments of Rome, Paris, and Turin that has yet appeared. Every inch of that tangled controversy is, with surprising rapidity, laid bare to the broad light of a most searching and tenacious analysis. The reader of these chapters, who masters the statements, notes, and references, has in his hands all the clues of the Italian question, not merely as regards the temporal power of the Papacy, but the Neapolitan question, and the relations of the French and Sardinian Governments. But the most powerful passages are, perhaps, those in which the Bishop addresses an *argumentum ad hominem* to the Emperor, on the score of his own solemn language at various periods since his election as President of the Republic, regarding the policy and duty of France towards the Papacy. The way in which all these declarations and engagements, spreading over a period of fifteen years, are culled together, compressed into a few pages, and then contrasted with even the most favourable view of the Convention, is masterly. It is even said that this part of the pamphlet caused the Emperor himself extreme anxiety, which he did not affect to conceal.

As regards the latter portion, which refers to the Encyclical and Syllabus, in order to appreciate it justly we must carefully consider the purpose at which Mgr. Dupanloup aimed, and the audience to which his work is more immediately addressed.

It results from the unhappy circumstances of our time, that the Holy Father cannot inculcate Catholic truth in its relation to civil government without being suspected of a wish to encourage disaffection against existing constitutions ; nay, and to propagate the faith, if he had only power at his command, by means of the sword. If many men of educated and well-balanced minds are under this strange misapprehension, what may be expected from violent poli-

ticians, or reckless and unscrupulous journalists? "No one who accepts the Encyclical can be loyal to France;" "he cannot even honestly swear to obey the Constitution;" "he would at once, if he could, take away from non-Catholics all liberty of worship;"—such were the clamours which for many weeks resounded throughout France, and tended most powerfully to estrange public sympathy from the Pope and the Catholic cause. What the crisis required, was not some careful and accurate statement which should express Catholic doctrine with dispassionate and subtle precision; for the public mind was so excited, that such a disquisition would have fallen dead on its ear. The occasion called for some pointed, epigrammatic, telling brochure, which should encounter the anti-Catholic faction on its own ground, and meet the rhetorical advocacy of error by a rhetorical advocacy of truth. This inestimable service was performed by the Bishop of Orleans; and the unprecedented circulation of his pamphlet shows how accurately he had discerned the exigencies of the time and the disposition of spirits.

As to the main point of attack—the Pope's teaching on liberty of worship—Mgr. Dupanloup limits his propositions carefully within the bounds of orthodoxy, even when most earnestly intent on exposing anti-Catholic misstatements. He admits without a moment's question, not only that the condition of Catholic unity is far the highest and happiest for a nation, but also that where such unity exists it should be retained by help of material force. Yet, not in his own name only, but in that of the Pope and all ecclesiastical authorities, he indignantly disclaims all desire to propagate religious truth by means of violence. Having vindicated the civil ruler's true function where religious unity exists, he thus proceeds: "But does this mean that when circumstances have changed, and public right also, Catholics would fail in their duty to God and the Church, by accepting sincerely without *arrière-pensée*, their country's constitution and the liberty of worship thereby authorized? or, that, if we speak of liberty when we are weak, it is that we may refuse it to others when we shall be strong? Of all the accusations ordinarily hurled against us, this has always appeared to me the most insupportable."

This very important pamphlet raises one or two questions which require more careful consideration than we have yet had time to give them; and we hope, therefore, to return to its consideration in our next number.

L'Encyclique et les Evêques de France. Paris: Dentu. 1865.

THIS volume is a collection of those most interesting Episcopal documents which we mentioned in the preceding notice; and it will enable Catholics to feel still more keenly the debt of gratitude which they owe to M. Baroche and to a still higher personage, for eliciting them.

The anti-Catholic party throughout Europe has laid great stress on the supposed discrepancy between the respective episcopal interpretations of the Papal act; whereas to our mind the doctrinal unity of these interpretations is not a little remarkable. All the bishops agree (1) that, under the present circumstances of most European countries, a concession of civil liberty to all existing worship is the one course consistent with wisdom, and even

with justice. All the bishops agree (2) that, even if any Catholic considered that liberty undesirable, such a circumstance would by no means dispense him from the obligation of loyal citizenship and obedience to the constitution. On the other hand, all agree (3) that, where Catholic unity exists, the civil ruler should maintain it inviolate by legal enactments; and (4) that such a state of unity is a higher and more normal condition than that which now prevails. All the bishops agree in these broad outlines; they differ only in the colouring they give to the picture, and the details with which they fill it up. As regards such particulars, we certainly regard Mgr. Dupanloup's comment, *e.g.*, as less thoroughly in harmony with the spirit of the original than Cardinal Patrizi's in Rome, or than such as would be put forth in France by the Bishop of Poitiers or of Montauban: but the difference, as we have said, is of colouring and detail, not of doctrine and principle.

It may be worth while here to speak briefly of the extraordinary allegation put forth by French anti-Catholics, that no one can honestly swear obedience to the constitution, who disapproves in any respect those principles of '89 which are its basis. English Catholics may appreciate this allegation by an obvious parallel. No part of a constitution is more momentous than that which concerns marriage; and the English marriage law is now based on a principle (the moral lawfulness of divorce *à vinculo*) which is considered anti-Christian, not by Catholics only, but by very many Anglicans. What would be said of an allegation that on this account the Protestant Bishops of Oxford and Salisbury cannot honestly take an oath of obedience to the constitution?

The Holy See, in fact, has decided again and again that a Catholic may swear fidelity to such constitutions; and, of course, that he is bound by his oath. Nay, in the "*Mirari Vos*," Gregory XVI. warmly commends the early Christians for their faithful obedience to heathen governments: and heathen governments were certainly, in any Catholic's judgment, founded on a far larger amount of evil principle than are the worst modern constitutions; even that of Belgium itself. We recur to this subject in a later notice.

Another very interesting feature in the volume before us, is the unanimity with which all the Gallican bishops express, or unmistakably imply, the obligation incumbent on Catholics, of accepting with interior assent all the doctrines of Encyclical and Syllabus. We may not impossibly revert to this in a future number, and quote a series of passages on the subject.

Les Objections Populaires contre l'Encyclique. Par MGR. DE SEGUR. Paris.

IT is impossible to praise too unreservedly this most admirable little compendium. A few extracts will best give to our readers some taste of its quality. Firstly, then, is there an obligation of interior assent to the doctrines enunciated?

"The Pope being Vicar of Jesus Christ, the supreme and *infallible* teacher of the Church, . . . it is evident that when he *teaches* or commands anything in an Encyclical, every Christian is bound in conscience to submit

himself. . . . 'He that *believeth* shall be saved, and he that *believeth not* shall be condemned.'" (Pp. 4, 5.)

Is the Encyclical unseasonable? on the contrary, pre-eminently seasonable.

"The principles" which it inculcates "although as old as Christianity, were every day being more forgotten. For three hundred years the blasphemies of Protestant sects, then of politicians, then of Gallicans, then of Voltairians, lastly of omnigenous revolutionists, had enveloped them in such a fog of prejudice, that a large number even of Christians [*i.e.* Catholics] regard them, either as strange inventions, or as superannuated antiquities, a mere resuscitation of the middle ages. Since the evil was ever increasing, the Holy Father could no longer delay applying a remedy to the wound. The wound is grievous and deep; the remedy direct and energetic; and therefore it is that the sick man cries out loudly." (Pp. 9, 10.)

Is the Encyclical an attack on modern constitutions?

"If there are modern constitutions—and unhappily there are very many *such*—which are not in full harmony with the kingdom of Jesus Christ and the teaching of His Church, that is no fault of Pius IX.'s; the Encyclical does but defend God's constitution, attacked as it is and assailed by revolutionary ideas. Let us add nevertheless that as regards Catholics who live under one of these constitutions in which falsehood is mixed up with truth and evil with good,—the Church in no way forbids these Catholics to take an oath of fidelity to the sovereign, and also to obey the Constitution: the Holy See has formally and repeatedly declared this." (Pp. 14, 15.)

Does the Church command all Catholic rulers to repress error by material force?

"Pius IX. says simply to Catholic governments, 'There is but one true religion. . . . if through the misfortune of the times a Catholic governor is obliged to put it on the same level with false religions . . . he ought at least to regret such a state of things and never consider it a regular and normal state. . . . A governor truly Catholic should then give the greatest possible facility to bishops and priests for exercising their holy ministry; he should prevent the spread of heresy so far as circumstances and the law of prudence may permit. . . .' The Pope desires no other 'dragonnades' than such as these. . . . In our time especially the Church has no wish to conquer souls except by methods of gentleness. Who would even conceive the thought of employing violence in order to impose the faith? The Catholic Church respects those spirits which are *bond fide* in error, while pitying them and striving to enlighten them. Intolerant and absolute as she is when there is question of doctrine, she is tolerant and full of charity where the question is only of persons." (Pp. 24-6.)

We entreat our readers to procure this pamphlet; and we should be delighted to see it translated into English.

Les Catholiques Libéraux. Par M. l'Abbé JULES MOREL. Paris: Giraud. 1864.

WE are at one in principle with M. l'Abbé Jules Morel upon the subjects of vital interest with which he deals, and which may be summed up and included in the one great question of the separation of the Church from the State, with its corollaries and consequences; and, in particular, the severance of civilization and social progress from Christianity.

M. Morel esteems this to be the menacing heresy of the nineteenth century, which is subtly infiltrating itself everywhere, and would, were it possible, seduce even the elect. Yet, at the dawn of modern society, when the retiring waters of the revolutionary deluge allowed men once again to feel firm ground under their feet, no doctrine, perhaps, was regarded with more aversion than this divorce between the temporal and the spiritual; and the Concordat with Napoleon, notwithstanding all its drawbacks, was hailed as an incalculable blessing. The alliance of the spiritual and temporal authorities continued to be regarded by Catholics for many years as in itself an immense advantage, in spite of all those abuses of the civil power, which resulted in dragging the Supreme Pontiff to Savona and to Fontainebleau. M. Morel does not hesitate to assert that in 1815 a proposal to separate Church and State would have met with no support from either clergy or laity. Fifty years have worked a marvellous change, and what the necessities of the times have rendered practically acceptable, has come to be regarded by numbers as even theoretically admirable.

M. Morel considers that there are but four great European journals and periodicals which are thoroughly uncontaminated with the slightest taint of liberalism—the *Civiltà Cattolica* at Rome, *Le Monde* at Paris, *L'Armonia* in Piedmont, and *Le Bien Public* in Belgium. The list certainly is short as respects the Continent, and these British Isles are probably not included in his field of vision. M. Morel, we must warn our readers, is somewhat severe and exclusive, and a shade too "tranchant," we should say, not in tone alone, but even in some of his practical judgments. Principles are unbending and rigid things—like mathematical truths, they are what they are; there is no scope for the more or the less; but when translated into the domain of facts, just like mathematical truths themselves, they not only admit but often require qualification. We hardly think that M. Morel has always taken circumstances into account, and we record our opinion with the less scruple because with his principles we have unreserved sympathy, and we are glad to be able to quote in our support one of those very periodicals which possess his confidence, and, we may add, our own. The *Civiltà Cattolica*, the Roman review, while commending M. Morel's able work, suggests that in dealing with Mgr. Ketteler, he has hardly made sufficient allowance for the peculiar local circumstances in which that eminent prelate is placed, or for the practical difficulties to meet which his work entitled "*Liberté, Autorité, Église*," was written. Of the prelate himself, in his episcopal capacity, it is just to state that M. Morel speaks with the highest respect.

Four writers on modern liberalism have been selected to represent the doctrines and tendencies which he sets himself to oppose,—Mgr. Ketteler, the Abbé Godard, the Comte de Falloux, and the Vicomte de la Guéronnière. The Principles of '89 are of course the object of attack under the second head. It is the condemned work of the Abbé Godard, published in 1862, that M. Morel analyzes. This paper is a reproduction of some articles inserted by him in the *Monde* at that time. This will account for the occurrence of certain vehement and indignant personal apostrophes which were natural while the author was yet living, and had not made his praiseworthy and

honourable submission to the Roman censure, but which (since M. Morel owns to having made a few alterations to adapt the article to the present epoch) we could regret he has not now omitted. It would in no way mar the value of the argument, which is still opportune. The condemnation by the Index has, it is true, for ever withdrawn the book in its old form from the hands of the clergy; but it must not be forgotten that before Rome had spoken, it received very generally a most enthusiastic reception; and it cannot be said that all the arguments by which the censured propositions were maintained have been laid aside with the book itself. We were, indeed, hardly prepared for the startling character of much which it contained, or to find that the errors condemned were so boldly prominent.

The author's strictures on the vindication of the Principles of '89, as well as many of his remarks on Mgr. Ketteler's work, are justly conceived and vigorously expressed with his usual terseness and pungency. We would point attention to his way of dealing with the justification of the Declaration from the charge of antagonism to Revelation, on the ground that by assuming the natural law as the basis of legislation, no opposition to the Christian revelation need be implied; for it lies at the root of the question. It is unlawful for a baptized people to return, in their social and political relations, to the natural law. If that tie between God and His reasonable creatures suffice when the revealed law is unknown, to revert to it in full Gospel light is an apostasy. Is it to be supposed, indeed, that our Lord has, so to say, left us the choice between two constitutive ideas of the formation of the civil and political state and of international law; and that it is optional to us either to base such formation on the Gospel, or altogether to make abstraction of Christianity in government and legislation? The Christian law, though not opposed to the natural law, transcends it, and, as a matter of fact (which experience has abundantly demonstrated) will continually be brought into conflict with those rights which the legislator finds in his abstract code. M. Morel demonstrates that, from the very nature of things, the attempt to make abstraction of Christianity in government and legislation must result in the oppression and persecution of the Church; if for no other reason, because the civil law, by adopting a non-Christian basis, necessarily takes no account of a whole range of duties, precepts, and requirements which spring therefrom. What a field for assaults upon the Church by infidel men in power, or indifferent and weak men intimidated by the revolutionary party, banded together for the destruction of Christianity, such a state of things provides, it is needless to observe. The Catholic liberal party may read in contemporary history a daily lesson of disappointment, calculated to disenchant them of the hopes founded on the prevalence of the new theories of government and of liberty. The free Church in the free State is a chimera, as M. Morel shows again more at large in all its absurdity, as hypothetically applied to the Roman States, when he comes to treat of the Vicomte de la Guéronnière's pamphlet.

It is, perhaps, not generally known that Pius VI. condemned the Principles of '89 in very strong terms, when the revolutionary assembly of Avignon and the Comtat Venaissin promulgated the famous "Declaration" on the banks of the Rhone. In a Brief dated April 23rd 1791 addressed to his

rebellious subjects, the Pope qualifies the seventeen articles as ascribing to man "*jura religioni et societati adversantia*."* It would seem, after this sentence, to be a little superfluous to put on our spectacles to examine each of these propositions, in order to ascertain their conformity with Catholic doctrine, since *in globo* they have been pronounced by the highest authority to be "adverse to both religion and society." But we are now met by a question of some importance, which M. Morel discusses in a postscript on the Abbé Godard at the end of the volume. The latter was permitted, as is well known, to republish his book as corrected and approved at Rome. The Abbé discusses the value of such approbation. Does it amount to a recommendation? Does it imply an endorsement of every opinion expressed therein, or an acknowledgment of the veracity of every fact upon which such opinions are grounded? Does it say anything with respect to the expediency, or usefulness, or reliability of the work as a whole? Evidently not. The Roman theological examiners confine themselves strictly to their province: they act as censors, not as teachers. Their decision as to the dogmatic harmlessness of a work is purely negative, and does not amount to any favourable judgment of its general contents. It simply declares that the book contains no proposition which, viewed in its connection with Catholic doctrine, is worthy of censure. But might it not be expected, at least, that historical blunders relating to ecclesiastical matters should be pointed out? Certainly not; unless these mistakes help to support a heterodox argument. Were it otherwise, instead of simply censuring, the college of Roman theologians would be undertaking a complete education in theology, canon law, and ecclesiastical history. If you want to learn, you must go to the Roman universities. The Abbé Godard says that "he knows of no Pontifical document condemnatory of the seventeen articles of the Declaration." Certainly there has been no Papal decision to that effect requiring the assent of faith; but it is not true, as we see, that there exists no Pontifical declaration which condemns them. Yet this assertion is allowed to stand in the approved work, while it would be perfectly ludicrous to imagine that the Roman theologians were ignorant of or had forgotten the Brief in question—a supposition quite allowable in the case of the Abbé Godard. His assertion simply proves his ignorance; but since there is nothing heretical, or bordering thereon, in his making such assertion, it passes unnoticed by those whose sole concern is with orthodoxy.

Another question will still occur, which M. Morel has previously answered. How can good Catholics swear to a constitution bearing at its head the seventeen articles, in the face of a Papal declaration that they are opposed to religion and civil society? Our author ably shows that the obedience which binds us to a secular government *has nothing dogmatic in it*. We refer our readers to the passage itself, wherein it is demonstrated satisfactorily how Catholics cannot write certain books on the "rights of man" without being put on the Index, while they are free to swear to a constitution professedly based on these rights. The consequences which would spring from

* "*Recueil des Décisions du Saint Siège*," tome ii. p. 106. M. Morel supports every step of his argument by a reference to Papal decisions, of which he gives the text.

any other view prove its absurdity. They would entail even the non-lawfulness of Concordats, which always imply a greater or less derogation from the fulness of the Church's rights, in condescension to the necessities of the times.

The paper on "Le Parti Catholique," although in substance it has our sympathy, is the least pleasing to us of any in the volume. It exhibits a tendency to extract the worst possible consequences from the statements of an opponent, which is elsewhere manifested, though not so prominently. M. Falloux has done good service to the Church's cause in France. It is true he belongs to the "liberal" party, and, as such, we, in common with M. Morel, believe he is often chargeable with inconsistency. All error, and especially that of the well-intentioned, implies inconsistency; but this inconsistency has again its two sides—its good and its bad. We prefer to see a worthy and honest opponent confuted rather by the application of those good principles which he holds, than by a continual squeezing and compulsion of the defective portion. We think that such a course fails to win or convert adversaries, who, rejecting the conclusions forced upon them, have some reason to feel, if not to think, that they are unfairly dealt with. M. Falloux is an advocate for the Church's throwing herself into the liberal spirit of the age; he considers that, as a matter of fact, the clergy committed a fault by allying themselves too closely with the State at the Restoration; and that it would be a mistake to pursue in education systems which take no account of modern ideas, aspirations, and feelings. He is of opinion that by the loss of their temporal wealth and political position the French clergy were cured of their Gallicanism, and the tie which unites them to the Head of the Church became practically more close and intimate. Upon all these and cognate topics M. Falloux holds strong opinions, which are, we are persuaded, founded, as regards some of them, on misconception, while in all they are more or less disposed to run to exaggeration; nevertheless, it is possible throughout to discern a certain amount of accompanying truth, which he perceives, and is labouring to express. His intention, his *animus*, are clearly excellent; and it appears to us that a process by which the good ore might be separated from the alloy, and the danger pointed out of confounding the Church's power of adaptation to different times and circumstances, with a dereliction of her essential and fundamental principles, would be far more fruitful in good than the evolution of all the evil consequences which can be extracted from the least indulgent construction of the author's meaning.

No one, perhaps, lays himself more open than does the able author of "Les Catholiques Libéraux" to a parallel treatment by his adversaries, who could with ease find, in his startling mode of statement, and in his rigid application of principles to facts, scope for misinterpretation and misrepresentation. We regret that such drawbacks should exist in a work so truly sound and valuable.

L'Erreur Libre dans l'Etat Libre. Par M. le Comte de BEAULIEU. Palone, Paris.

THIS work, as its very title indicates, is a reply to M. de Montalembert's Malines orations. Its subject is closely connected with portions of the recent Encyclical and Syllabus; and we have accordingly both given an extract from it in p. 452 of our present number, and also inserted in p. 479 the Papal approbation with which M. de Beaulieu has been recently honoured. At no distant period we hope to make large use of the work in discussing the whole question which it treats. Here we will only say that every one must admit its tone and spirit to be most temperate and courteous; and that in our own humble judgment its appeals to the Church's authority are cogent and irresistible, while its arguments from human nature and from history are absolutely conclusive. We heartily recommend it to the careful study of all our readers who are interested in the subject.

What does it profit a Man? University Education and the Memorialists.

By THE SON OF A CATHOLIC COUNTRY SQUIRE. Burns, Lambert, and Oates, London.

WE profoundly dissent, as we need hardly say, from the recent memorial to Propaganda, whether we regard its substance or its form: yet we cannot regret that it has been started. Firstly, as our present author observes, it enables us "to rejoice with a feeling of security that there is so small an exception to the general rule" as the memorialists present (p. 23); and it has been the signal for a remarkable display of Catholic unanimity on the opposite side, for which we cannot be too grateful to God. Then again, the need of some higher education for English Catholics is so very urgent, that we are glad of anything which will fix attention on the subject. Lastly, we cannot but rejoice at whatever has given occasion to the pamphlet before us: for this pamphlet, in our judgment, gives to the whole subject the fullest and most complete treatment which it has yet received; it is written with a spirit and attractiveness of style which enchains the reader's attention; while it derives both a special charm and a special importance, from its author avowedly belonging to the old Catholic stock.

Its general argument is this. There are in England two rival traditions—if we may speak of rivalry where one is so enormously preponderant—the Catholic and anti-Catholic: the one being that which, on the whole, held undisputed sway up to the sixteenth century; the other that which now over-spreads the land. This latter clothes itself in most different shapes. "The curious combination of colours found on looking into the kaleidoscope of the Protestant Church (p. 15) is but one of its developments."

Read the light literature of the day; . . . See the teeming press. . . . Study the political principles of Lord Palmerston, the peculiar Christianity of Lord Brougham, the tendencies of our Houses of Representation, the *ton* in the society of the upper ten thousand; gauge the practical religion of the million, their code of morality; look into that beautiful and pure lily, the Court of Divorce, and you will find that in this great Babel and bewilder-

ment; in this endless and dizzying metamorphosis and change; in this mutability of voice, and of gesture, and of tone, and of principle, and of thought; in this external manifestation of an internal, energizing life,—this much is certain,—viz., that though, indeed, the manifestations are different,—as the oak differs from the fragile anemone that grows under it,—still, they are all voices of the same great reality, and are but variegated signs of the one great, pervading, energizing, Protestant principle that is, *forma corporis*, the animating spirit of the variety of movements we observe. They are, after all, one consistent whole,—differing indeed, yet receiving their being, their vitality, their force from, knit and dovetailed and jointed together by, that all-pervading principle which has taken possession of the mind of this country, at least since the days of the twenty-fourth of Henry VIII. (pp. 15, 16).

Now, the one national duty imposed by God on Catholics, as such—the one trust committed to their charge—is the faithfully retaining and propagating among their countrymen true religion. Such an education, therefore, as may fit them for more effectively fulfilling this trust is a good education; such as may render them less fitted for that great end is a less good education; but that which would teach them to ignore the end itself—to forget the vital contrast between the two traditions—would be immeasurably worse than none: it would, in sober truth, be that very education which Satan most earnestly desires them to receive.

Already intercourse with Protestants has impaired “the full flower and perfect bloom of Catholic thought” (p. 10). English Catholics have not resisted so successfully the world’s blandishment as they did the world’s persecution.

In the rough weather we doubled our cloak (of the old tradition) around us,—all tighter and closer for the very roughness,—and went our way; but in these days of calm and of sunshine we may be apt to throw it off (p. 12).

But what is it which threatens us now? The Protestant principle “maintains its very life in the University.”

It is there this great monster principally feeds, and takes in and masticates, and digests, and converts into blood and bone and muscle and sinew the food which has been carefully prepared to his English palate at the great *proscholia* or grammar-schools of the kingdom. . . . The real, genuine vocation of Oxford, its steady and persevering object, is to inform the minds of men with that great Protestantizing principle which is the centre life of the thorough-going Englishman of the present day. As sure as the food which is thrown into the human system, and comes in contact with the different dissolvent animal juices, is resolved into chyme, and then passes into the blood and into the bone, and becomes a portion of the living, breathing man, so surely will the human intelligence sent up to Oxford, and thrown into contact with its system, its method, its influences, its talent, and its atmosphere, be at last—however averse to it at starting, however indigestible the food—reduced into the consistency of a pulp, and assimilated and absorbed into the great monster system, composed of the most deep, the most subtle, the most powerful, the most learned and masterly intelligences, of the land. That any human intellect or moral nature—except through an interposition which we have no right to expect—could hold its own, and bear up against the enthralling, the fascinating, the constraining, the overpowering pressure brought to bear at that focus of intellectual power, appears on the very face of it a moral impossibility:

"La faccia sua era faccia d' uom giusto ;
Tanto benigna avea di fuor la pelle ;
E d' un serpente tutto l' altro fusto."^{*}

How much more glaringly patent, then, must it not be, that a young man with all his notions to form, or at least to consolidate and to fix, who is sent to the University for the express purpose of being educated, will naturally and necessarily melt down into that form which is in keeping with the genius of the place ; and though he may not know it, and even be unwilling to admit the fact, will be assimilated with the companions with whom he lives to the great principle working within him, and end as a necessary consequence in becoming part and parcel of that great tradition which once handled the fire and the fagot, but which now, with a more humane policy, professes civil and religious toleration.

Meanwhile—

The Holy See can view with clearer eyes than we can the dangers of our age. She knows what are our interests in the long-run—our *true* interests—far better than we can get to know them ; and in the face of the world, with a sublime contempt of the opinions, prejudices, views, and wisdom of the Protestant principles, gives forth her utterances with a clear, decisive, articulate, authoritative, and unmistakable voice. The Catholic principle of the wide-spread world has stood face to face with the Protestant principle of this island. If you would read the programme of the former, peruse the Encyclical and the Syllabus ; if you would read that of the latter, open the volume called "Essays and Reviews." In which direction are the children of our fathers to go ? Will they gain a *tendency* to assimilate the Encyclical at Oxford ? will they learn to treat with a respectful spirit the eighty condemnations there ? (pp. 21, 22).

But there is a still worse result than the destruction of the old Catholic principle in the individual—its destruction throughout the land. If young men are Protestantized within an inch of their Catholic life, if it were possible for them to keep the essentials of religion, having all tarnished save the very centre heart, what will become of the next generation ? If the Memorialists' sons—I mean those who have sons—are sent at eighteen or twenty to Oxford, and are then thrown upon the world, and then marry and settle down, what manner of Catholics will their children be ? Who will care any more for the old Catholic tradition ? What will at length become of those holy beliefs, those pious opinions—nay, even those fundamental truths—which from one generation to another, the great Catholic family of this kingdom shall have had their ears hardened to hear abused, mocked, spit upon, as loathsome, sickly, drivelling, priest-ridden idiotcies ! (pp. 41, 42).

To all this it is answered that the Church possesses adequate safeguards for Catholic interests. Our author gives an admirable reply to this objection (pp. 45-49) ; but the same reply in effect was still more tersely expressed by a correspondent in one of the Catholic newspapers. The Church undoubtedly possesses full safeguards, both for faith and morality ; but among the principal of these is to prescribe *the avoidance of evil company*. We have no doubt at all that this is the one which she will adopt in the present instance, as that which alone is appropriate to the occasion ; and those who do not choose to accept its protection may haply perish through their indolence.

^{*} *Inferno*, canto xvii.

We have been surprised—or, rather, we have not been surprised—by observing that the *Union Review* in its last number (p. 129) makes a curious comment on our argument. The writer declares that we imply the existence among English Catholics of “something gravely wrong,” when we maintain that great evils would accrue to youths of keen and earnest intelligence from habits of familiar intercourse with Protestants.* Does the writer, then, doubt, *e. g.*, that refinement of manners is impaired by constant familiarity with the coarse and vulgar? or (to take a more serious illustration) that pious men are injured by friendship with profligates? or does he censure the admirable efforts of his co-religionists (would that those efforts had been successful!) to close Oxford against Dissenters? But it is needless to multiply questions: every fresh number of the *Union Review* does but show more clearly how just is the charge brought against its writers by Propaganda, of tending directly by their evil maxims to foster that monster evil of our age, religious indifferentism.

As to the memorial itself, a few words will suffice. No one, of course, can doubt that education very closely concerns faith and morals; the simple question, therefore, is, has Rome, or has she not, received from God the commission of guiding Catholics on faith and morals? Many of the memorialists, we believe, would die rather than give a negative answer to this question; and yet the memorial implies a negative answer. Certainly to *adduce evidence* is no usurpation of the judicial office; nor would there have been any cause of complaint, had a number of Catholics forwarded a body of well-authenticated facts bearing on the point in hand. But this is the very thing which the memorialists have not done. They have not attempted the production of evidence, but they *have* volunteered to pronounce judgment. They have omitted to do that which appertained to them, and they have contented themselves with doing that which belongs exclusively to ecclesiastical authority. The English bishops submit their judgment to that of Rome; but the memorialists claim that Rome shall submit *her* judgment to that of a few laymen.

Several Catholics, indeed, who had unwarily signed the memorial, have retracted their act in a language of humility and simplicity which most fully atones for it; and we believe that many more, whose names are still appended, have not sufficiently pondered what the memorial implies. But on this we need speak no further: our notice is already too long, and we will at once conclude it with the renewed expression of our heartfelt gratitude to the writer before us, and with a hope that this is but the auspicious beginning of many invaluable services to be hereafter rendered in the Church's cause.

* We never said, or implied, or thought, that such Catholics “would be almost certain to desert their faith;” but we did say that its purity and simplicity would suffer grievous detriment.

The Formation of Christendom. Part I. By THOMAS WILLIAM ALLIES.
Longman. London : 1865.

NO one can read these lectures without deeply regretting that the writer has not given us more, and that the exigencies of practical duty prevent him from devoting his whole time to intellectual pursuits. At such a period as this, when the Church so urgently needs the best intellectual efforts of her children, it is lamentable that her cause does not occupy the undivided energies of one, possessing so thoroughly Catholic a spirit, so large a body of learning both ecclesiastical and secular, so beautiful and attractive a style, and so much power of sustained thought.

Mr. Allies, however, has chosen a subject which will call forth his full abilities : a subject not more connected with history than with theology ; not more with Christian history than with heathen ; not more with the broad and salient facts of the past, than with those acts and thoughts of everyday life which lie below the surface. How far he will thoroughly rise to the height of his great argument, it is premature as yet to decide ; if here and there we may desiderate some little thing to complete his view, that something is very probably but deferred to another volume. "The Formation of Christendom" was characteristically founded, as the author most justly observes, on the formation of the individual Christian. The present is but the first of four volumes, and Mr. Allies has not yet proceeded beyond this foundation. We should be inclined, however, to say that he is less absolutely satisfactory in his treatment of the heathen than of the Christian character ; and nothing certainly can be more admirable than his three last lectures.

It is absolutely necessary in these days of classical cultivation to impress on scholars the appalling abominations of heathen immorality. This necessary, but most repulsive task, has been courageously performed by our author ; and here he stands in most favourable contrast with the general run of Protestant historians. His readers, however, on this very account must be prepared for a certain shock.

But the volume is far too important to be dismissed with a short notice. In an early number we hope to devote to it an article, in connection with M. de Champagny's invaluable labours on the same field of inquiry.

An Introduction to the Philosophy of Primary Beliefs. By RICHARD LOWNDES. London : Williams and Norgate. 1865.

THIS work has been forwarded to us by its author. He is not a Catholic : and his two last chapters, which enter more or less into matters of theological controversy, appear to us poor ; the last of all especially so. But we have not observed any *philosophical* opinion of Mr. Lowndes, opposed to any teaching of the Holy See with which we are acquainted, or which may not be embraced by any Catholic to whose reason it commends itself.

Mr. Lowndes's spirit seems to us truly philosophical. He endeavours to obtain the greatest possible light from those who have preceded him, and studies them with respectful docility. On the other hand, he will not be led

blindfold by any merely human authority : but judges for himself, whether the various arguments which have been adduced are really cogent ; and whether the various phenomena of human nature which have been alleged accord really with experience. He thinks accurately, and expresses his thoughts clearly ; and the volume is well worth reading to a philosophical student. Its most characteristic features are the following two.

He has laid stress on an inquiry to which philosophers in general have been far from attaching its due importance. What are those primary beliefs of man on which his whole superstructure of knowledge and convictions must be based ? By what test are they to be distinguished from the prejudices of education and the idiosyncrasies of individual character ? When such test has been duly applied, what is the authority of such primary beliefs, and on what ground does that authority rest ? Mr. Lowndes lays stress, we say, on this inquiry, and will lead all its readers to see its fundamental and paramount importance ; but he does not himself pursue it to its ultimate issue, nor profess fully to answer the questions which he raises.

A still more characteristic feature of this volume is its reply to that theory of God's incognizableness, which has been started by Sir W. Hamilton, and much developed by Professor Mansel. Both these eminent philosophers teach, that man in this life can have no positive apprehension whatever of the Infinite ; that his whole notions of God are purely negative. Every Catholic thinker must observe at once the enormous and even grotesque contrast between this doctrine on the one hand, and the whole animating principles of Catholic theology on the other. The said theory, moreover, is so violently opposed to the experience of every one who engages in prayer, that we may well marvel what can have blinded its originators to its manifest falsehood. The only real question is, Where does the fallacy of their argument chiefly lie ? Excellent comments have been made on the theory by Mr. Calderwood and by Professor Young ; and Dr. M'Cosh, in his very able work on "Intuitions," supplies (we think) a complete refutation of it. Yet no one has, perhaps, coped with it more successfully than Mr. Lowndes. The implied assumption on which it proceeds, as he most ably points out, is simply this — that what cannot be *imagined*, cannot be *positively thought* ; and the main drift of his work is to collect and apply materials for refuting this assumption.

There is one illustration of Mr. Lowndes's argument which is, perhaps, more effective than any of which he himself has made use. We refer to that knowledge of good and evil which, as Pius IX. teaches us, "is engraven by God on the hearts of all." It is surely quite undeniable that all men possess that positive idea, which is expressed by the term "morally laudable ;" yet it is equally undeniable that we cannot ever so faintly *imagine* or *picture to ourselves* this idea.

This, then, is the sum of Mr. Lowndes's argument. "I grant," he says in effect, "that we cannot imagine God, or picture Him to ourselves ; but it is utterly unsound to infer from this, that we cannot, therefore, positively think of Him."

Le premier Jésuite Anglais martyrisé en Angleterre, ou Vie et Mort du Père Edmond Campion, de la Compagnie de Jésus. Par le R. P. ALEXIS POSSOZ, de la même Compagnie. Paris : Douniol. 1864.

A GOOD, substantial, and comprehensive biography of Father Campion is still a desideratum, especially to English readers. A life is wanted that shall fill up the *lacunæ* left by the old writers Bombinus, More, Alegambe, Tanner, Schmidl, Bartoli, Reiffenberg, and the other historiographers of the Society of Jesus. That materials are not wanting has been abundantly shown by the writer of several articles on Father Campion's life, which appeared in the later numbers of the *Rambler*, and which brought much collateral information to bear upon the subject. With the exception of those articles, we are not aware that any attempt has been made in England to collect into one whole the scattered pieces of information which have been handed down to us concerning this remarkable man. And now that the state papers relating to those eventful times have been made accessible to the public, we suspect that further search and examination would increase our stock of fragmentary contributions.

And, indeed, any further information about this holy priest should be welcome to us all. Already in his early years the report of his "sharp and pregnant wit" penetrated far beyond the circle of his domestic friends, and was so widespread that the Merchant-Adventurers', or Grocers', Company (it is not known which) provided for his education at their sole cost. He showed himself no undeserving object of patronage; for he soon became champion, not only of Christ Church Hospital, but of all the grammar-schools of London; and by common consent was chosen to speak the address to Queen Mary on her solemn entry into London in 1553. The Queen was pleased with him, and the populace lustily cheered him. His presence at St. John's, Oxford, soon made itself felt and duly appreciated. His powers of oratory were calculated to make him somewhat vain, and his companions somewhat envious; but in the midst of his success, his sweetness of temperament always made him a favourite. In fact, one of his chief characteristics was his power of pleasing and charming others, and of making himself universally esteemed—a characteristic that runs through the whole course of his life. He is said to have filled Oxford with Campionists. Here, too, he was selected to welcome Queen Elizabeth at her visit to that university in 1566, and to defend a set of philosophical theses in her presence; his particular friends, knowing the bent and state of his mind, having been careful to caution him against uttering any theological opinions. Are we not naturally interested in the career of one whose early years were so full of promise?

Yet, spite of all this worldly success, the worm of conscience was silently gnawing at his heart's core. He had, not without great reluctance, submitted to take the oath of supremacy, and even to receive orders in the schismatical Church. The still small voice whispered in his ear that an eternity was at stake, and Campion at last determined to make his peace with God, at whatever risk. Of his departure from the University, stay in Ireland, residence in Douay, Rome, and Prague, labours in the missionary field of England till his capture and execution, we leave his biographer to speak.

We have dwelt thus far upon the earlier years of Campion's life, because the events of his youth, though of very great interest, are not so commonly known; and we have done so thus summarily, by way of showing that the protomartyr of the English Jesuits, whose pupil whilst he staid at Douay, Cuthbert Maine, was the proto-martyr of that College, was a man of unusual natural powers and abilities. We see from his conduct in religious life that his powers of bodily endurance and mental activity went hand in hand. No burden, no accumulation of offices entrusted to his administration, was too much for him. And in the peaceful serenity and joy of his mind and heart, he writes to his dearest Father Persons—"Why should I not be well? I have no time to be ill." The more we read of his actions and sayings, the more we admire his virtuous character; and every new thing told of him tends further to his praise and our edification.

For these reasons we were pleased to see that Père Possoz had undertaken to place before the reading public a life of Campion, in a more accessible form than has been hitherto possible. This work, which is illustrated by a portrait of the saintly Father, taken originally, if we mistake not, from the painting in the English College at Rome, is compiled principally from the older writers we have mentioned above; and, like their works, has been written rather for edification than as a complete biographical history. We have been given to understand that in the second edition, which the author is now preparing, additional matter will be introduced, and the numerous orthographical errors corrected, which stand forth only too conspicuous in the English names of persons and places. Correct orthography in this matter could hardly be expected from a foreigner who, consulting Latin writers, was forced to extract the English names out of their Latin form, itself frequently rendered incomprehensible by careless transcription or typographical inaccuracy.

As an appendix the author has given a short sketch of the English and Irish martyrs of the Society of Jesus up to the year 1652. Why the writer fixed upon that particular year as the one with which his sketches should terminate, we are at a loss to conceive. A few pages more, containing a short account of the lives of those whose names he has omitted, would have made the whole a more complete work.

Histoire de Jules César. Tome Premier. Paris: Henri Plon. 1865.

History of Julius Cæsar. Vol. I. London: Cassell, Petter, and Galpin.

THE style of the Emperor Napoleon is not the least of his achievements. It is at once simple, massive, and splendid. He understands how to express his ideas with a clearness that makes them vivid to vulgar minds, as well as a condensation which gives them an abode in the understanding of the studious. At the same time, his general conceptions have a complete artistic harmony, while some of his occasional sentences are of the rarest order of eloquence. It would be difficult to recall, for example, a more noble or spirit-stirring passage in modern oratory than that in his address to the army of Syria:—"Aujourd'hui où l'on voit passer le drapeau de la

France, les nations savent qu'il y a une grande cause qui le précède, un grand peuple qui le suit." The whole series of his documents of state—discourses, letters, messages, proclamations,—form a not less interesting literary than historical study.

How a sovereign, who leads a life of such incessant and various activity, ever found time to write a *Life of Julius Caesar* must, we suppose, remain a mystery and a marvel until the author's own most personal memoirs are published. The style itself is an elaborate affair: all His Majesty's composition has the air of being long revolved and carefully polished; and every line of *Cæsar* is done as pointedly as the last little speech on a Cardinal's hat, or letter to an embarrassed ambassador. When Lord Macaulay, who was an author by vocation and profession, determined to write the "*History of England*," he abandoned public life. When Mr. Gibbon devoted himself to the "*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*," he simply bound his life up with his book. Lord Derby has translated "*Homer*," but Lord Derby is not in office; and a translation, after all, is only a translation. The *Life of Cæsar* is a work quite original in the avowed point of view of its conception, and in all the details of its execution; and so far as we have any information on the subject, it must have been chiefly composed during a period of the author's life when he can have had little respite from some of the most embarrassing difficulties of his reign, and when he had matters of policy peculiarly onerous and galling, such as the Roman, Mexican, and Polish questions, continually pressing upon his mind. But after all, the book has probably been the object of thought, the labour, the relaxation too, of more years than any one knows. It is very likely that what is being finished in the Palace of the Tuileries may have been planned in the Prison of Ham.

It must be admitted, however, that so wonderful a book is not without its flaws; and that while its merits are modest, its faults have an offensive effrontery. The preface, which the *Moniteur* trumpeted in advance of publication, and which found its way forthwith into every paper in Europe,—after all, begins with a *banalité*, and ends with a *bêtise*. What is the meaning of saying that "historic truth ought to be as sacred as religion"? It is like a proposition from the Syllabus. Truth is a virtue of religion. The historian is bound on his conscience to tell truth; but not more so than any other utterer of words. There is nothing in the nature of history (to take an extravagant comparison) that makes it more sacred, for example, than the evidence of a witness or the confession of a penitent. The sentence, in fact, means nothing in particular, and is simply a piece of flashy French fudge. It would be quite as good sense to say, "A Sous-Prefet is naturally invested with all the authority and majesty of the Emperor." But the last sentence of the preface beats the first. "Every day since 1815," it says, "has verified the prophecy of the captive of St. Helena—'How many struggles, how much blood, how many years will it not require to realize the good which I intended to do for mankind!'" And to this is added a note—"In fact, how many disturbances, civil wars, and revolutions in Europe since 1815!—in France, Spain, Italy, Poland, Belgium, Hungary, Greece, and Germany." After all, the true criticism on such sentences as these is, that they only tend to make

one believe that there is a soft spot forming in the Emperor's brain. During the fifty years before Napoleon, were there no disturbances, civil wars, and revolutions in Europe? And did his conduct tend to increase or diminish the number? Does not the catalogue, moreover, imply that the countries which escaped or resisted his influence were most free from revolution? Notably the Emperor counts neither Russia nor England. Again, is it because the designs of the First Napoleon were not consummated that all these disturbances took place? Let us, then, suppose France sublimely content with the revived empire. But certainly Spain and Belgium show an excessive nervousness whenever there is question of the extension of Napoleonic ideas. What Poland and Italy have gained through their sympathetic influence is not conclusively obvious. As for Hungary and Greece, there is not an atom of evidence that the first Emperor ever gave a thought to them, or that a single event which has happened in either country for the last century would or would not have happened if he had never been born.

Intending to review the *Vie de César* as soon after the publication of the second volume as possible, it is only our affair here to notice its salient literary curiosities. The present volume pauses on the eve of the most interesting period of the great Roman's career,—his wars in Gaul. It is divided into two books, one of which contains a rapid retrospect of the history of Rome before Cæsar, and the other an account of his family, birth, youth, and his conduct in the offices of Quæstor, Ædile, Supreme Pontiff, Proprætor, and Consul. Every line of it is written as if with an assiduous application of the writer's whole mind. Every reference and illustration shows scholarship and study. Especially he has the original authorities,—Appian and Arrian, Livy and Dio, Cicero and Sallust—literally at his fingers' ends. Of modern writers on Roman affairs—Mommsen among the Germans, and Duruy among the French—are more than once referred to with high praise. Drumann, Hahn, Zumpt, Heeren—Germans; Amedee Thierry, and the Count de Champagny—French; Capito, Maffei, Marini, Orelli, Della Marmora, the Duke of Serra di Falco—Italians, are quoted; but, strange to say, not one English writer on Roman history,—not Arnold, nor Gibbon, nor Sir George Lewis, nor Merivale,—is so much as named. Stranger still, Niebuhr's name is only once casually mentioned. Yet it would, we think, be possible to show from intrinsic evidence that the Emperor is not unconscious of these writers' researches. To suppose that he studied early Roman history without reference to Lewis and Niebuhr, or the transition from the republican to the imperial institutions without reference to Arnold, Merivale, and Gibbon, would, in fact, be absurd.

We will not say anything at present concerning what we may call the policy of the book—its argument of the Providential mission of Julius Cæsar, and of Cæsars in general. To English readers, much the same theory is familiar through Mr. Carlyle's writings on Hero-worship; only, instead of Cæsar, Charlemagne, and Napoleon, the English author would ask us to make idols of Mahomet, Cromwell, and Frederick the Great. The parallel of the First Napoleon to Cæsar is evidently in the Emperor's mind throughout; and, indeed, it would appear as if we were expected to see the parallels of Cæsar's successors reproduced too near us to be pleasant. "In fact," says

his Majesty, "neither the murder of Cæsar, nor the captivity of St. Helena, have been able to destroy irrevocably two popular causes overthrown by a league which disguised itself under the mask of liberty. Brutus, by slaying Cæsar, plunged Rome into the horrors of a civil war; he did not prevent the reign of Augustus, but he rendered possible those of Nero and Caligula." We are aware of the modern Augustus; we can even guess the Napoleonic Nero; but who may Caligula Bonaparte be?

The Iliad of Homer, rendered into English Blank Verse. By EDWARD, EARL OF DERBY. In two volumes. London: J. Murray. 1864.

WE may apply to Lord Derby's translation of the Iliad what Dr. Johnson said of a dog standing on his hind legs: "People admire him, Sir, not because he does it well, but because he does it at all." The high character, political integrity, and extensive influence of the author, will ensure its being read by thousands and praised beyond its deserts. Its accuracy, classical style, and freedom from pedantry, will please a large number of persons on whom nicer shades of poetic refinement would be lost, but, as time goes on, it will sink from its sudden popularity, and serve perhaps to bring more prominently into notice that translation into English blank verse with which alone of all our versions it can fairly be compared. It will disappoint all who have the soul of poetry, because it possesses every excellence but that one which is the most indispensable of all. Pope's Iliad is a poem; Cowper's is poetical; Lord Derby's is prosaic. Though neither heavy nor pompous, though it flows like a full river, it is utterly unlike the clear stream of Homeric verse. The musical thunder, the sunlit foam, the overflowing banks, the feathery spray, the magic colours, the playful might, where are they? We seek them in vain. Those who read Lord Derby alone will be at a loss to conceive on what the stupendous fame of Homer rests. There are in his version no picture-words, no perfect forms of expression, no "mighty lines." The glow of poetic enthusiasm is wanting, and so is the individuality and strength of true genius. It is the work of an orator, a scholar, a man of cultivated taste, but not of a poet. The writer has followed the advice Phaeton would not take—*medio tutissimus ibis*.* He drives along between prose and poetry, equally distant from each, and never, to use Pope's simile, "becomes on fire like a chariot-wheel, by his own rapidity." His epithets are too often tame and commonplace, and his sentences, when otherwise well sustained, frequently break down in one member through sheer want of the poetical afflatus. If Pope and Cowper had never existed, his version might have held a proud place in our literature; but although in his preface he modestly omits all mention of the latter, and disclaims the presumption of entering into competition with Pope's "happy adaptation of the Homeric story to the spirit of English poetry," yet by the mere fact of appearing in the lists he challenges comparison with his illustrious predecessors. Now Pope was endowed with a genius of high order, rich and varied in its developments, while the gentle

* Ovid. Metam. II. Fab. I. 137.

Cowper was also gifted with true genius, and was the most popular poet of his day. Each had run a poetic career, had been nursed in the Muses' lap, and fed with the honey of Hymettus. This can hardly be said of Lord Derby; and when we compare his renderings with the harmonious couplets of Pope and the severer elegance of Cowper, or with the great original, we try them, indeed, by the highest of all standards, yet by one of which the translator cannot complain.

It has become the fashion to disparage Cowper and Pope, to maintain that the former congealed Homer, and that the latter bottled up his streaming waters in couplets, and coloured them until they became as gaudy as the window of a chemist's shop. But these are frivolous exaggerations. Rhyme had been to Pope from childhood the most natural expression of ideas. "He lisped in numbers, and the numbers came." The measure he chose for the *Iliad* is, in his hands, well suited to his purpose, and he is by no means so far from the original as many persons suppose. He generally succeeds in conveying its spirit, and often surpasses Homer himself. When he fails, it is the failure of no ordinary workman, and compensated by some unlooked for charm either in sense or sound. In reading Cowper's version of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, we are constantly struck by ingenious renderings, bold metaphors, delicate expressions, and musical cadences indicative of a poet, and are less frequently than in Lord Derby's translation interrupted by platitudes, and language that grates on the ear.

We cannot illustrate these remarks better than by citing at random a few passages from the work before us, and placing them side by side with the original and Cowper's corresponding lines. In this way our readers will be in some degree enabled to judge which of the rivals ought to carry off the palm.

There is a famous passage in the fourth book where Homer first describes a battle. The scene opens with an elaborate simile :—

Ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἐν αἰγιαλῷ πολυηχίῃ κῦμα θαλάσσης
 Ὄρνυτ' ἵπασσύτερον, ἑσφύρον ὑποκινήσαντος·
 Πόντῳ μὲν τὰ πρῶτα κορύσσεται, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
 Χέρσῳ ῥηγνύμενον μέγ' ἀλὰ βρέμει, ἀμφὶ δέ τ' ἄρκας
 Κερτὸν ἰὼν κορυφοῦται, ἀποπτύει δ' ἄλδς ἄχνην·
 Ὡς τὸτ' ἵπασσότεραι Δαναῶν κίνυντο φάλαγγες
 Νωλεμέως πόλεμόν τε.

Lord Derby gives it thus :—

"As by the west wind driven, the ocean waves
 Dash forward on the far-resounding shore,
 Wave upon wave; first curls the ruffled sea
 With whitening crests; anon with thundering roar
 It breaks upon the beach, and from the crags
 Recoiling flings in giant curves its head
 Aloft, and tosses high the wild sea-spray:
 Column on column, so the hosts of Greece
 Pour'd, ceaseless, to the war."

Let us now listen to the author of the "Task":—

"As when the waves by Zephyrus upheaved
Crowd fast toward some sounding shore, at first,
On the broad bosom of the deep their heads
They curl on high, then breaking on the land
Thunder, and o'er the rocks that breast the flood
Borne turgid, scatter far the showery spray ;
So moved the Greeks successive, rank by rank,
And phalanx after phalanx."

Here all is ease, elegance, and strength, whereas there can, we think, be no doubt that the version before it is a laborious failure.

The battle of the eagle and serpent in the twelfth book has been translated by Cicero,* imitated by Virgil,† and beautifully expanded in the "Revolt of Islam."‡ Let us see how it looks in the hands of Lord Derby and Cowper:

Ὅρνις γάρ σφιν ἐπῆλθε περυσίμεναι μεμῶσιν,
Διέτρεξ ὑψιπέτης, ἐπ' ἀριστερά λαὸν ἱέργων,
Φοινίχεντα δράκοντα φέρων δνύχισσι πέλωρον,
Ζωὸν, ἔρ' ἀσπαίροντα· καὶ οὕτω λήθετο χάρμης·
Κόψε γὰρ αὐτὸν ἔχοντα κατὰ στήθος παρὰ δεξιῶν,
'Ιδνωθεὶς ὑπὸ τῷ ὀδ' ἀπὸ ἔθιν ἤκε χαμᾶζε,
'Αλγήσας δδύνγσει, μίσφ δ' ἐνὶ κάββαλ' ὁμιλῶ·
Αὐτὸς δὲ κλάγξας πέτετο πνοιῶσ' ἀνέμοιο.

The following is Lord Derby's translation:—

"For as they sought to pass, a sign from Heav'n
Appear'd, to leftward of th' *astonish'd* crowd ;
A soaring eagle in his talons bore
A dragon, huge of size, of blood-red hue,
Alive, and breathing still, nor yet subdued ;
For twisting backward through the breast he pierc'd
His bearer near the neck ; he, *stung with pain*,
Let fall his prey, *which* dropp'd amid the crowd ;
Then screaming, on the blast was borne away."

Nothing can be tamer and more inelegant than some of the expressions in these lines, and Cowper's version will very well bear to be contrasted with them, though it is by no means a favourable specimen of his ability as a translator:—

"For, while they press'd to pass, they spied a bird
Sublime in air, *an eagle*. Right between
Both hosts he soar'd, the Trojan on his left,
A serpent bearing in his pounces clutch'd
Enormous, *dripping blood*, but *lively still*
And mindful of revenge ; for from beneath
The eagle's breast, updarting fierce his head,

* De Divinitate, i. 47. + Æn. xi. 751. ‡ Canto I. viii.-xiv.
VOL. IV.—NO. VIII. [New Series.] 2 P

Fast by the throat he struck him ; *anguish-sick*
 The eagle cast him down into the space
 Between the hosts, and, *clanging loud his plumes,*
 As the wind bore him, *floated far away."*

Nerve and fidelity mark this rendering throughout, as may be noticed particularly in the words printed in italics.

If we could pursue this comparison to greater length, it would bring out more fully that minuteness, as it were, of Flemish painting, which Homer combines with his grandeur, and which Cowper never fails to appreciate ; and it would tend to show that genius only can translate genius, and that the blind old wanderer of Chios* has found a very devoted but very imperfect representative in the present distinguished leader of the Conservative party.

Omnia pro Christo. A Sermon at the Solemn Requiem of His Eminence Nicholas Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. By H. E. MANNING, D.D. London : Knowles. 1865.

Verbum in Corde Optimo—Fructus in Patientia. A Sermon preached in the Cathedral of Northampton, on the death of H. E. Cardinal Wiseman, by the Right Rev. F. K. AMHERST, D.D. London : Burns & Co. 1865.

Sermon in Memory of Nicholas Cardinal Wiseman, preached in St. Joseph's, Bunhill Row. By Rev. JAMES CONOLLY. Dublin : Duffy. 1865.

THE first of these sermons would have received emphatic notice in our memorial of Cardinal Wiseman, but for a reason which will be easily understood by those who read that memorial. To our minds, the sermon is unspeakably touching in its simplicity and truthfulness. The preacher has most thorough faith in his subject ; he contents himself, therefore, for the most part with stating facts, and leaving them to speak for themselves. The two others are also affecting memorials ; especially the bishop's, whose intimacy with the deceased belonged chiefly to the time of his presidency at Oscott. The bishop tells us (p. 14) that that beautiful work, "*Fabiola*," was written while the Cardinal was watching at the bedside of a former pupil, "during the tedious hours of the night and the broken slumbers of the fevered patient." A hundred anecdotes of the same kind are fully attested.

La Vie de la Bienheureuse Marguérite-Marie, Religieuse de la Visitation Sainte Marie. Par le P. CROISSET, de la Compagnie de Jésus ; &c. ; avec une Introduction, par le P. CH. DANIEL, de la même Compagnie. Paris : Charles Douniol.

IN his introduction to this little book, P. Daniel announces the speedy appearance of his more extended life of the Blessed Margaret Mary. In the mean time he has been induced by the general interest of the faithful in her Beatification, to publish the present volume, consisting of a short life by P. Croiset, author of the little book called *La Dévotion au Sacré Cœur de*

* Hymn to Apollo, ver. 172.

notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ; which was written at her desire—a memorial left in her own handwriting, in which she had set down under obedience a narration of the singular graces which she had received from our Lord—and the decree of her Beatification. It is nearly two hundred years since Blessed Margaret Mary entered into her rest in the Sacred Heart of Jesus, where she has remained hidden until now, honoured only by the ceaseless adoration of Christendom to that Adorable Heart. Why has He now called her forth from the glory which had so long shrouded her from the eyes of men, to shine visibly and singly in our darkening sky? The men of our day, in their vain janglings, have confounded their Creator with His own creation, and dissolved their living and present Redeemer into a fable, a myth, or a misty shape seen afar off in history, of one like to themselves, whom they may scan and criticise, praise, censure, and excuse, as they would Socrates or Cæsar.

So amid all this strife of tongues, Jesus, as if He heard them 'not, stoops down and writes the name of Margaret Mary amongst the Blessed, and sets it as a light over the Tabernacle, where, in His Divine Personality, and in the perfect sympathy of His Human Heart, He is "with us all days, even unto the consummation of the world."

The Month. Simpkin, Marshall, & Co. February, March, 1865.

DR. NEWMAN'S "Saints of the Desert" continue their quaint sayings in the "Month." They lead our thoughts back to the "Church of the Fathers," published many years ago in the *British Magazine*, and also to the "Ancient Saints," which appeared in the *Rambler*. We cannot yet judge what the series will prove as a whole, but it promises to be highly curious and interesting. Were it not for the initials with which the contribution is signed, we should often fail to discover the pregnant sense involved in the simple words of this or that Abbot.

Dr. Coleridge's "Life of Suarez" is completed in the February number. It is valuable chiefly on account of the influence he exercised over the development of Catholic theology. In English history he is well known as having written, at the request of Pope Paul V., a work against James I., and the oath of allegiance which he exacted. It was entitled "*Defensio Fidei Catholicæ et Apostolicæ contra errores Sectæ Anglicanæ*," and "so provoked the English Solomon," as Dr. Coleridge says, "that he not only had it publicly burnt, but wrote a most absurd letter of complaint to Philip III. of Spain. It had also the singular honour of being burnt by the Parliament of Paris, under Calvinist influence." The sketch before us is taken principally from Massei, and reproduces in a pleasing manner all the more salient points in Suarez's controversial career. His private life and devotional habits are vividly painted, and also the joy and peace with which he met his end, and said in words, which have since become famous, "I never thought that it was so sweet to die." Of "Constance Sherwood," we spoke in our January number. "The Stolen Sketch" is another and shorter tale which deserves praise. The story is anything but commonplace, and is told with touching and elegant simplicity. It turns on a picture from Tennyson's poem, "Enid,"

in which the artist gives her mother's face and form to the poet's conception of Enid's mother. The sketch, for it is no more, is lost, and found at last in the Academy Exhibition, completed and ennobled by a consummate master of the art, Edward Vance. The heroine and her sister had fixed their affections on him; and the former had mortified hers with a view to promoting Hessie's happiness. This self-denial failed in attaining its end. Vance, who was supposed to have stolen the sketch, had in fact inveigled Hessie into giving him what was not hers. Hessie repents of her fault, and the sisters rejoice together in their escape from one who would have proved unworthy of either. "Cardinal Consalvi" is a neat epitome of Crétineau-Joly's recent publication, which we review ourselves in this number. The "Month," on the whole, seems to combine amusement and instruction in fair proportions; and both these are found happily united in the "Glimpses of Rome," as in most of Julia Kavanagh's writings.

Christendom's Divisions. By EDMUND S. FFOULKES. London: Longman.

THE publication of this work by a writer professing himself to be a Catholic, and in communion with the Holy See, is far too serious a matter to be disposed of in a short notice. We will recur to it, therefore, at greater length in our next number; and will at present merely amaze our readers by a few extracts.

"The whole Church," at a certain period of her history, "*delegated to*" the Pope "the same executive powers over Christendom generally, that had been already delegated to metropolitans over provincial, and to patriarchs over diocesan, churches" (p. 19).

"There were some specious grounds, at all events, for deciding as she did" (p. 12).

"The" Church's "second stage towards monarchy had been actually attained before the conversion of Constantine" (p. 16).

"The headship of emperors is a thing that has been tried and laid aside: what therefore remains, but that of the Pope?" (p. 35, note).

"Had Christianity never encountered a world-wide empire at its birth . . . it is quite possible that the idea of a supreme earthly head of the Church would have never occurred at all to its professing members" (p. 37).

"I sincerely believe myself that a Church . . . without any supreme head . . . but One who is there worshipped in faith as ever present, is the loftiest and most Evangelical idea of a Church by far; and that, to a certain extent, this was actually exhibited in . . . the three first centuries" (p. 35).

"If His Church was to have a supreme head at all upon earth," Christ "vested that dignity in S. Peter and his successors" (p. 37).

"The principle of a supreme earthly potentate" was not "conceded without reproof . . . 'Get thee behind me, Satan, thou art an offence to me; for thou savourest not the things of God, but those that be of men,' said our Lord to that very St. Peter whom He had just before designated as the rock on which

He would build his Church; *neither can one passage be applied to his successors without the other*" (p. 36).

"Through the instrumentality of" St. "Peter's successors, *one part of His Church*" was "bound together in a compact mass" (p. 37).

"The Church of England . . . and the bodies that spring from it . . . are . . . destined, perhaps, to play an important part in any future schemes for *re-union of the whole Church*" (p. 34).

"Where" Popes and Cardinals "have discharged" their appointed "task faithfully and efficiently, there is no *class of men* entitled to more respect and honour at our hands. . . . Where they have not discharged that task, or made it subservient to their own interest or aggrandisement, *there can be no greater enemies of the whole human race*. . . . It would be unjust and contrary to fact to insinuate that *nothing else but* their rivalries and backslidings . . . have caused our divisions" (preface, pp. xiii, xiv).

WHEN we criticise the preceding work more at length, we shall take the same opportunity to comment on an article first published in the "Union Review," and which has now appeared separately, under the strange title, "Experiences of a 'vert.'"

DR. MURRAY has kindly forwarded to us successive portions of the new volume of his treatise on the Church, now passing through the press. The volume will not be completed before our present number appears; but we hope in July to give a careful account of it. Meanwhile, we cannot deny ourselves the gratification of adducing his great authority in behalf of a proposition, on which our readers may remember that we have recently been laying considerable stress. We have found, to our extreme surprise, that some English Catholics, who intend no disloyalty to the Church (we know not whether the infection has reached Ireland), have denied, or at least doubted, the Church's infallibility in pronouncing those various censures which are less severe than that of "heretical." Dr. Murray pronounces (p. 226) "that the opinion affirming that infallibility, although not as yet expressly or in terms defined, is [immediately] revealed, and is therefore definable as of Catholic faith." He also says (p. 235) that the said infallibility *is held as certain by all the grave and approved writers on the subject whom he has seen*.

MR. WALKER'S translation of the Encyclical and Syllabus is very carefully and accurately done. We can speak on this with the more confidence, because we have ourselves gone over the same ground. We have found Mr. Walker's translation very useful in executing our own.

As we are going to press we receive F. HARKER'S "Sermon on Anglicanism tested by the Council of Ephesus." We can see at a glance that it covers very important ground, and we will notice it fully in our next number.

Foreign Events of Catholic Interest.

"POPE PIUS IX. seems," says the Bishop of Montauban, "within a finger's breadth of ruin, and yet he speaks as spoke Boniface VIII. and St. Gregory." The true glory of Rome is that in every age the Popes are ever found not only speaking and acting in the interests of society, of truth, and of God; but speaking and acting under the Divine guidance. This is the secret of the power of the Papacy. The world of unbelievers affects to be astonished that a feeble old man, supported at Rome by foreign bayonets, should exercise such dominion over the minds of men; yet in every age it has recognized, not the material only, but the moral power of the Popes. This power has formed the most conspicuous feature in the history of Christendom; it is now the great political question of the day. Such an act of power as Pope Pius IX. has exercised in his Encyclical Letter of the 8th of December last, has kept at bay the enemies of the Papacy, and has baffled the hopes of those who deemed the old strength and glory of Rome had departed. It has arrested the attention of the whole of Europe, and has fixed the minds of men, even against their wishes, on the great lesson which it inculcates—that there is no safety for society unless it be based upon God. The Papal Letter calls, in the Divine name, upon men to return to the Christian principles of faith, of morals, and of government. It condemns in eighty propositions those theories which, under the specious names of liberalism, of progress, and of modern civilization, have been more or less extensively adopted of late in the various countries of Europe.

How such a call and such a condemnation, as are contained in the Encyclical and the Syllabus, have been received by the press and by the people, by the governments and by the churches in the various countries of Europe, is of the highest importance to know, since such a knowledge would afford a curious insight into the state and temper of the times in which we live, and enable us to form a correct judgment as to the religious character of modern Europe. Such an historical record, however, cannot yet be written; we have, nevertheless, been at some pains to discover so far the effect produced in different countries by the Papal Bull; and such a sketch as we can now only give, of the impressions it has already made on the mind of Europe, may perhaps serve as an introduction to a future history of the Encyclical Letter of the 8th of December, 1864.

Of the Encyclical itself we are not here speaking in detail; we will only say that in clear and concise terms it deals with principles which affect all the relations of life, and which lie at the bottom of every intellectual, moral, and religious difficulty of the age. It sums up in a compendious form all the recent decisions of the Holy See touching such difficulties, and stamps them with new authority. It is the testament of Pius IX. to the world he wishes to save. It is the living and divinely-guided voice of the great teacher who does not judge, as his enemies themselves affirm, events according to the judgment of men, and whose acts show a complete forgetfulness of mere worldly wisdom. It is this unworldliness of the Encyclical Letter which gives it such a power. In it everything is referred to the Divine standard of measurement, not religious questions only, but matters of the world also. It is this exhibition of the supernatural which has so startled men, and stung so many into such an activity that they cannot help, in spite of themselves, speaking without cease

of the Encyclical Letter from Rome. They misinterpret its words, they distort its meaning, but nevertheless its substance and its essential truths are slowly penetrating into the mind of Europe.

The Encyclical of the 8th of December was uttered at a moment when men imagined that the power of Rome was broken. Beseet by his enemies, and betrayed by France in the Convention of 15th September, the Pope it was hoped, perhaps, rather than thought, would sue for reconciliation; but the calm words and deliberate condemnations by Pius IX. of the principles which were the life-blood of his enemies and of the enemies of the Christian name took the world by surprise. There was a momentary lull. Then came a roar like that of a wild beast mortally wounded. It was the yell of the impious and atheistical press throughout Europe. This cry of pain and rage has not yet ceased. "What sort of men are they who attack the Encyclical and the Syllabus which is annexed to it," asks the Bishop of Rodez, in a letter to the Minister of Justice and of Worship, "your Excellency knows them better than I do. I do not believe that I am deceived in saying that they are, for the most part, men who do not believe in the Church,—Protestants, Jews, Freethinkers, Saint-Simonians, Pantheists or Atheists, which comes to the same thing. Not only do they not believe in the Church, but all their efforts are directed to destroy it; and this dark plot, hatched in the Masonic lodges, explains the fury with which they attack the supreme Pontiff. . . . I need not point out the organs of the periodical press, by means of which these enemies of our faith and worship strive to lead the people astray; all the world has heard their clamours and seen their attitude in the presence of the documents which have emanated from the Pontifical Chair." Not knowing, the Bishop concludes, what further arguments to invent against the civil Princedom which guarantees the spiritual independence of the Holy See, the leaders of the revolutionary movement have greedily seized the opportunity of hurling indiscriminately anathemas against the Pope-King and the Pope the Head of the Church. This description points out the motives which urge the revolutionary writers of France to attack and pervert the Papal document; but in the first instance the government press endeavoured to break the force of the blow, which was felt in the highest quarters. The Encyclical Letter was described as a document similar to many others coming from Rome, which had no public interest; it contained nothing new, and left matters just as they were before; it was only the enemies of the Church, and the enemies of modern political society, who ascribed to it a dogmatic importance which it neither has nor claims. This mode of attack was a miserable failure. The importance and dogmatic character of the Papal decisions were recognized almost instantaneously throughout the country. Other tactics were adopted. It was admitted that the Encyclical of the 8th of December was inspired by the same spirit and set forth the same condemnations as were to be found in the celebrated "*Mirari vos*," of 1832; but it was insinuated that the Liberal current was too irresistible in the bosom of Catholic society to accept this new manifestation of Roman doctrine. It was argued that as the condemnations pronounced by Gregory XVI. against modern liberties had not prevented Liberal principles from penetrating into Catholic minds, so that at present it could not be doubted that eminent prelates and distinguished writers would be found "openly to declare themselves to be of their times and of their country." The insolent hope that eminent Catholics would turn traitors and rebels has signally and gloriously failed. The scene-shifters of the Imperial policy of France were once more employed in the hope of producing the effect desired before the final chorus of abuse, from the mouths of the impious press, was allowed to burst upon the world.

The opinions of what are called moderate men were next paraded before

the public. An appeal was made, not to the judgment of philosophers and freethinkers, but to the reason and conscience of enlightened Catholics, to draw a distinction between such Papal acts as are merely concerned with spiritual interests and matters of faith, and such documents as affect, like the Encyclical, *Quantâ Curâ*, temporal interests and political principles. If the Holy Father confined himself to point out and condemn errors opposed to the truths of the Catholic Church, reasonable politicians and enlightened men of the world would not be in the least offended; but now, it is argued, they do declare themselves to be mortally affronted because he did not "confine himself to launch an anathema against materialism, pantheism, and rationalism." "Behold," cry out these writers we are alluding to in their journals, "he sallies forth from the Sanctuary; he departs from the limits assigned to his spiritual jurisdiction, to extend his influence and authority over matters which are not within his province—over civil and political interests.*" The "pretensions" they argue of Gregory VII. and those of Pius IX., when probed to the bottom, are found to proceed from the same source and the same principle; but all such pretensions, they loudly declare, are not only opposed to the public, but also to the ecclesiastical, rights of all modern nations, whether Catholic or not. But when these philosophical critics of the Vicar of Christ found that they persuaded in vain the Catholic world to clip the authority or to limit the rights of the Holy See by such a boundary as would exclude the Pope from all jurisdiction over the principles which govern the every-day life of men, they too joined in the attacks of the ignorant, the profane, and the impious. In one Parisian journal alone, which makes more than ordinary pretensions to scholarship, the Bishop of Orleans points out no fewer than seventy grave or grammatical errors in the rendering of the Encyclical Letter into French. Never before, in recent times, has such ignorance and such malevolence disgraced the vast majority of the press in France as has been displayed in regard to the eighty propositions condemned by the Papal brief of the 8th of December. The *Times* has caught a feeble echo of the obloquy from Paris, and has repeated, more perhaps in ignorance than in malevolence, accusations and misrepresentations without stopping or caring to consider whether they were true or false, for such is its habit when it treats of Catholic matters at home or abroad. Catholic truth, in its opinion, must be concealed at all costs from the honest mind of the English people. Therefore, especially when the Pope speaks to the Christian world on subjects of grave interest to all believers in the Divine Revelation, the *Times* garbles his words and perverts his meaning, lest the light of truth should penetrate the dark cloud of prejudice which helps so much to separate England from the Church of Rome. The more manly course of fair criticism and of a serious statement of objections, has yet to be learnt by the writers in our English press. The *Indépendance Belge*, the easily-recognized leader of the infidel and Masonic press of Belgium, is endeavouring to make capital out of the Encyclical and the catalogue of condemned propositions, in the interest of the masters whom it so unscrupulously serves. One of its chief objects is to entangle the Catholics of Belgium in a controversy as to the principles of their constitution and the errors condemned in the Syllabus; but in order not to break the thread of our narrative by a discussion of principles, we shall reserve the few remarks we have to make on the Belgian constitution and the Encyclical to the end of this paper. They who know the character of the *Indépendance Belge*, are not surprised to find that in abuse and perversion it out-distances on this occasion even the worst of its Parisian contemporaries. True to their instincts, the organs of the Belgian Government and of the Masonic lodges feebly follow suit. But the Catholic

* *Journal des Débats.*

press, in loyally accepting the principles of the Encyclical, has nothing to fear from such adversaries. In exposing the false deductions, and rebutting the insolent assertions of the Masonic journals, it seeks to prevent the public mind from being led astray as to the true character of the Papal document, and as to the right application of the censures and condemnations it contains.

In Italy the press, subsidized by or devoted to the revolutionary party that has now the upper hand in the unfortunate peninsula, is but a faint parody of its Paris leaders in the criticism it bestows on the Papal letter. In the Government papers there is an evident hope that the public condemnation of false political principles will tend still further to alienate the French Emperor from the Papacy, and hasten the abandonment of Rome to the Revolution. In the present disturbed state of Italy, the minds of men are so much under the influence of political passions as to leave them easy victims in the hands of unscrupulous leaders, whose aim it is to root out the old reverence for religion in the hearts of the people. The agents, therefore, of the Revolution seize upon the Encyclical Letter, and endeavour, by the mis-use of its condemnations, to excite the popular feeling. But the influence of the revolutionary and irreligious press must not be overrated in Italy : its venal character is well known ; its circulation is comparatively limited ; and it in no way represents the vast mass of the people. The real political and religious opinions of the country are not to be sought in such newspapers as are supported by the Piedmontese Government, and quoted as authorities by the correspondents of the revolutionary journals of Europe. The tone of such Spanish opposition journals as have come into our hands has been neutral in regard to the Papal documents. There are no attacks to be found, as far as we know ; but a demand is made for liberty to discuss the Encyclical Letter as soon as it shall have been officially promulgated. In Portugal, on the contrary, the land of Freemasonry and triumphant revolution, where Church property is confiscated, where the religious orders are suppressed, and Sisters of Charity persecuted,—there has been neither moderation nor honesty in the treatment of the magnificent and uncompromising letter of Pope Pius IX.

The reception which the *Encyclical Letter* and the *Syllabus* of condemned propositions has met with in philosophical and rationalistic Germany is of so various a character as to render it impossible to be described in the space at our command. In Germany, where religious extremes meet, where philosophical disputes wax highest, such a document as that recently issued from Rome, brimful of first principles and of vexed questions in philosophy and religion, could not fail to excite a great sensation. From one end of the vast German territory to the other, the press has discussed the Papal document in all its bearings. In Catholic countries, as well as in Protestant, the attacks upon it have been of the gravest. The revolutionary and impious press is everywhere akin. The journals of Vienna have, perhaps, been the loudest in their abuse ; so violent, indeed, as, at least in one instance, to necessitate the intervention of the Government, and the punishment of the offending journal. It must, however, be remembered that the Viennese newspapers are, for the most part, edited by Jews, and written by unbelievers. Rage from such a quarter is natural. In spite of stupid and perverted translations, the *Encyclical Letter*, although it causes many a wry face and has turned many an indignant stomach, is working its way throughout Germany. The graver attacks of the Liberal journals evoke replies. Its contents are discussed, if too often in an unbecoming and violent tone, yet sometimes in an appreciative spirit. Its definitions as to philosophy and faith have attracted more attention in Germany than in France or Belgium, which are more affected by its political decisions. Its influence, therefore, is confined to a

narrower, because more learned, circle. What we most object to, however, is the lukewarm support, if it deserve even this name, which the Encyclical Letter meets with from some Catholic writers in Germany, who pride themselves on being free from all Ultramontane bias, and on being elevated to a level with the Liberal aspirations of the age. Such a treatment of the dogmatic teaching of Rome is worse than all the violence, all the misrepresentation, and all the falsehoods concerning the Papal letter, such as are now to be so freely found in the Liberal and rationalistic press of Protestant Germany.

In some of these latter journals, however, is sometimes to be discovered a truer appreciation of the state of things. It is not alone the French Minister, M. Rouher, who is able to see a certain grandeur in the attitude of the Pope.* The position of the Pope, alone in a beleaguered city, surrounded by enemies, whom he meets with undaunted courage and calmness, has a touch of the sublime about it, which is not without its effect upon the popular mind of Germany. "Without real material power," says the *Social-Demokrat*, the organ of the "General Working Men's Union" of Germany, "the Papacy stands in the midst of hostile elements; and defying the dangers which surround it, even with the possibility of losing its last protecting bayonets, it has, with all the pride of a thousand years' existence, opposed to a hostile world its unhesitating anathema. When did the followers of weak middle courses ever find the courage and the interior force in the midst of such dangers to rise to the height of such a language?" A spirit of miserable compromise could never have wrung from the lips of opponents such a recognition as the Papal words are finding even among the enemies of all religion.

But in spite of the misrepresentations of the irreligious press of Europe, the substance and the essential truths of the words spoken by Pius IX. have reached the minds of men. The whole world, Christian and unchristian, listens and is agitated. There is an unconscious conviction that a great teacher has spoken about things which it concerns all men to know. This in itself is a signal testimony to the spiritual empire of the Papacy. Men blame, men attack, men doubt; but they still recognize that the Pope is judging of things solely from a supernatural point of view, and laying down principles which are measured by no earthly measurement. Hence the attraction by which, in spite of themselves, men are drawn towards the Encyclical Letter of the Pope. It possesses a power they wot not of. They see, to quote again from the *Social-Demokrat* of Germany, "an old and sick priest, without gold, without iron, without land (for thus Johann von Müller describes Gregory VII.), mighty only by the power of the soul, rise up against an Emperor of Germany, and come victorious out of the contest. By dominion over the spirit—not by bayonets, not by cannons," it continues, "has the Papacy founded its power; and more than once, by that dominion over the souls of men, has it bowed down and humiliated those who, if they did not possess 'rifled cantons,' yet wielded all the warlike power of their times." Thus, even they who do not know the Divine source of the Papal authority yet confess, when they are honest enough, as we see, their reverence for a power greater than that of "the rifled cannon." The words of a Pope, even in the present day, it is acknowledged, are of more importance than the movement of armies. "The Pope," said a minister of France but a year ago, in the Senate, "is the chief representative of moral power in the world." The real significance, then, of the Encyclical Letter and of its reception, springs from its supernatural character. But this great Papal declaration of principles is not left only to the ignorance or malevolence of the irreligious

* In the recent debate in the Senate, M. Rouher acknowledges that two years ago, at least, he saw a certain grandeur in the attitude of the Pope.

press; some of the Governments of Europe have been so shortsighted as to join in the irreligious crusade. And foremost against right and liberty, against truth and justice, and against the public and the spiritual office of the Papacy, is found the Imperial Government of France. On the 1st of January the Minister of Public Worship addressed a circular to all the bishops of France, forbidding the publication of the first part of the Encyclical Letter and of the Syllabus, "as containing propositions contrary to the principles on which the Constitution of the Empire is based." To prohibit the bishops of France from explaining to their flocks teachings which the Pope, in the exercise of his spiritual office, has addressed to all the bishops of the world, is a violation of the inalienable rights of the Church. It is an open declaration of war against the Papacy. The prohibition is based on the organic articles which have never been recognized by the Holy See; and although by the artifice of the first Napoleon, they were subjoined to the Concordat of 1801, after the signature of the Pope had been attached to it, they formed no part of that treaty by which all the essential rights of the Church in France were secured. The organic articles, as soon as they were published, were formally condemned, as containing provisions incompatible with the rights of the Church, and with the free exercise of religion in France.

To revive them now is to renew the old war which the first Napoleon waged against the Holy See. Still more absurd is the attempt which is being industriously made to resuscitate the so-called "Gallican liberties," and to evoke a Gallican spirit in the Church of France. Gallicanism has almost died out in the country of its birth, and this attempt is indeed a return, to spoil the Egyptians of a favourite phrase, to the "abuse of a former age."

Some curious documents have just been published in the *Livre Jaune*, in which, among other matters, the Minister of Foreign affairs, M. Drouyn de Lhuys, delivers his comments to the French ambassador at Rome on the Encyclical Letter and on the conduct of the Papal nuncio at Paris. The Papal documents, he declares, have produced an effect which in general is far from favourable to the Holy See. In his opinion the condemnation of principles—many of which are justly considered as the indisputable possessions of modern society, and the resuscitation of principles which were regarded as abandoned for ever as belonging to a bygone age—could not have taken place under more inopportune circumstances. We need not allude to the manner in which the French Minister descants on the efforts which the Emperor has made to conciliate the great interests which the Court of Rome represents with those which it is the mission of governments to protect, for this is as much a Napoleonic common-place, and means as little, as the profession of his desire to protect the civil principedom of the Pope at the very moment when he is betraying it to its inveterate enemies.

In another dispatch the French minister triumphantly alludes to those writers who have taken upon themselves to defend, at one and the same time, the principles of the Church of Rome and those of modern liberty, and who now are forced to seek a common ground on which they may be able to reconcile the prescriptions of the Church and liberal ideas. And he adds, with a malicious joy, it is but too evident that they are the first hit by the doctrines proclaimed in the recent Encyclical Letter, and that henceforth they no more will be permitted, under pain of placing themselves in a state of disobedience towards the Holy See, to extol those liberal principles which, in different degrees, form the basis of the constitutions in most of the European states. M. Drouyn de Lhuys ought to know that Catholics, as earnest and genuine as those to whom he alludes, can have no hesitation in abandoning aims and views and principles such as are condemned by the Holy See, and which they have taken up solely under a mistaken desire of serving the Church and of saving society.

If, perhaps, Liberalism, like the toad squatting at the ear of Eve, has whispered too long its evil inspirations into the minds of some of the Catholics of France, no sooner is it touched by the Ithuriel-like spear of truth, than it starts into its true form, and is recognized and abhorred by those whom it sought to deceive. There is no dishonour, whatever sarcasms the French minister may scatter about, in Catholics of the highest order of intellect submitting their reason to the voice of the Divinely-appointed teacher who speaks from the Chair of Peter. In addition to a portion—considerable enough to enter into such a ministerial classification—of the clergy and of the laity which he maintains, without proof, to be still attached to Gallican opinions and traditions, and who, together with the liberal Catholics already alluded to, have no reason to be satisfied with the Encyclical, M. Drouyn de Lhuys declares that the immense majority of Catholics regard with a kind of astonishment and uneasiness the manifesto of the Holy Father. They are neither theologians nor casuists; it is enough for them to be of their time and to have grown up in the traditions and principles which constitute the essence of society as it exists at the present day. "All these Catholics," continues the minister, with increasing audacity and recklessness of statement, "are not mistaken in the far-reaching political meaning of this manifesto; they see in the Encyclical nothing but an attempted apology of the ancient *régime*. This is enough to explain the legitimate and profound regret which this document inspires in France." M. Drouyn de Lhuys concludes his elaborate and hostile criticism of the Encyclical Letter by remarking, with signal ill-grace and want of judgment, considering the quarter whence the remark comes, that the Papal Bull has put, more or less directly, a slight upon the Concordat concluded in 1801 between Pope Pius VII. and the august founder of the Imperial dynasty—an international act which the Holy See, he considers, was bound to respect in its letter and in its spirit.

To see, or to pretend to see, in a Papal condemnation of erroneous principles addressed to the bishops of the Catholic world an attempt to undermine the Bonaparte and restore the Bourbon dynasty in France is a transparent device to lead the minds of the people astray as to the true character of the papal document. On the political necessities, out of which some of the existing institutions in France and elsewhere in Europe have sprung, and which are their sole justification, no opinion whatever is pronounced; principles in themselves alone are condemned. If, however, the Imperial institutions of France, as M. Drouyn de Lhuys is at pains to avow, are based on erroneous principles, so much the worse for those institutions; for then, most assuredly, they contain in themselves the elements of destruction, which a compliance with the Papal warning may, perhaps, alone be able to avert. But, far from seeking a closer union with the Church, the tendency of Imperial policy is still further to widen the existing breach, and to deprive society more and more of its Christian character.

It is needless to remark that the prohibition to the bishops to publish the Encyclical Letter, together with the encouragement given to irreligious journalists to misrepresent and vilify the teaching of the Holy See, are evident indications of such a tendency. The severity, too, with which all Catholic criticism hostile to the Ministerial policy is visited* is something more than mere Imperial impatience at the comments of the newspaper press. The

* In January the *Union d'Ouest* was suspended for two months because of some fair critical remarks it made on the character of M. Baroche's circular, and the *Journal des Villes et Campagnes* has received the fatal "third warning;" the *Monde* also has just had a first warning inflicted on it; so also has the *Courrier du Dimanche*.

appointment of Prince Napoleon to be vice-president of the Council is not without significance. But the *Livre Jaune* affords further indications, if such be wanting, of the Imperial policy, in the complaints which M. Drouyn de Lhuys forwarded to Rome against the Apostolic Nuncio at Paris. In congratulating the Bishop of Orleans and the Bishop of Poitiers on their timely and noble defence of the cause and of the rights of the Pope, the Nuncio is accused by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of overstepping the limits of his character as ambassador. "An ambassador," he continues, "fails in his most essential duty when he encourages, by his approbation, resistance to the laws of the country in which he resides, and criticises the acts of the Government to which he is accredited." The Nuncio disavowed the publication of the letters, and expressed his regret to the Emperor at their publication. But M. Drouyn de Lhuys asserts in his dispatch that it was the writing itself of those letters, and not merely their publication, which the French Government had a right to complain of. It is, however, in the Imperial speech at the opening of the Chambers that all these indications of French policy find their full development. In this speech Napoleon deliberately commits himself to the Revolution. He approves of the course it has taken in Italy, and adopts its principles as to the rights of the civil power against those of the Church. To speak first of the course of the revolution in Italy: "The Convention of September 15th," we are told by the Emperor's speech, "setting aside passionate interpretations, consecrates two grand principles—the strengthening of the new kingdom of Italy and the independence of the Holy See." We find in this paragraph the defence of the usurpation of Sardinia regarded in precisely the same light as the preservation of the independence of the Holy See. They are both spoken of as two equally grand principles. And yet the civil principedom of the Pope is one of the most sacred of rights and the most legitimate of possessions, whereas the acquisitions of Victor Emmanuel are the mere results of revolutionary violence. But to attribute to accomplished facts, from the circumstance that they are accomplished, the force of right, is one of the propositions* condemned in the recent Encyclical Letter, and is at the same time a fundamental doctrine of the revolutionary party with which Napoleon has thus identified himself.

By the transfer of its capital, which is termed an act of patriotism, "Italy," the Emperor's speech continues, "definitively constitutes herself a nation, and reconciles herself at the same time to Catholicity." Now is this statement true in any sense? Has Italy, as a nation, definitively constituted or not, renounced Rome as a capital? It is notorious that the Sardinian Government counts after the stipulated withdrawal of the French troops, on an outbreak in Rome brought about by its unavowed agents in the secret societies and revolutionary committees. On the occurrence of such an event, the Franco-Italian Convention prescribes no course of conduct to either contracting party. Each reserves to itself the right of perfect freedom of action in such a case. The revolutionary government speculates on the connivance of Napoleon as an ultimate means of introducing Sardinian soldiers into Rome and of overthrowing the civil dominion of the Pope. In such a state of things what truth is there in the Imperial assertion that Italy now reconciles herself to Catholicity? But to put the question of the possession of Rome entirely on one side, and to read the course of events in Italy by the light of the Encyclical Letter, to what conclusion can we possibly come as regards the conduct of the Italian Government towards Catholicity, but to one diametrically opposite to the Imperial avowment? Far from desiring a reconciliation, it seeks to sever society from the Church altogether. It not only denies the

* In ordine politico facta consummata, eo ipso quod consummata sunt vim juris habere.

Church its public rights, and restrains its liberty, but it takes upon itself the management of ecclesiastical property, suppresses the monastic orders, and confiscates their possessions. It interferes by its laws with the exercise of Christian charity, and removes the clergy from the charge of educating the youth of the country.

It subjects the acts and decrees of the Roman Pontiff, referring to religion and the Church, to the Royal Exequatur, and subordinates the ecclesiastical authority to the civil power. In fact the Government that is aiming at constituting a nation on revolutionary principles cannot avoid continually and systematically traversing propositions condemned in so emphatic a manner by the Encyclical Letter of Pius IX.

Napoleon's statement that Italy now, through his agency, and by the adoption of the Franco-Italian Convention, reconciles herself to Catholicity, we can ascribe to nothing else than to a desire to blind, for a while, the people over whom he rules, as to his treatment of the Pope.

The assertion of the rights of the civil power as against those of the Church, which is made in the Imperial speech, cannot but be regarded as a protest against the principles of government inculcated in the Letter of Pius IX. But we will not dwell on Napoleon's appeal to rights based on the organic articles, or to abuses of the civil power, sanctioned by Gallican theories and supported by the authority of despotic Parliaments in other times, lest we should seem to impute to the French Emperor alone views common at the present day to so many statesmen and political writers in Europe. In tracing the influence of the Encyclical Letter on the European mind, it is however necessary to observe how it acts as a touchstone in eliciting principles, not only in the press, but in the governments and statesmen of the day. It is for this reason we allude to the interesting debate in the French Senate, for in those discussions the line of demarcation is distinctly drawn between antagonistic principles, and we see before our eyes the sifting process which the Papal Bull is already so fast effecting. Questions as to the relations between the civil power and the Church, which had been relegated to the discussion of learned societies, read now in the light of the Encyclical, have become political questions of the highest order and of the most exciting interest.

The calm but distinct exposition found in the Encyclical Letter of the rights of the Church in the government of human society, of the supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal order of things, is met by the fiercest invectives and the boldest assertion of the subordination of the ecclesiastical authorities to the State. These invectives and this assertion culminate in the speech of M. Rouland, formerly Minister of Public Worship. Considering his former office and his present relations with the Imperial Government, the gravest importance is not unnaturally attached to this deliberate manifestation of principles. The former Minister of Public Worship describes himself as a Gallican sincerely attached to the Declaration of 1682, and as abhorring with even greater sincerity all such doctrines as uphold the infallibility of the Pope, and his right to govern as a sovereign the religious world in the name of God, and which, he affirms, allow the Pope to absorb in himself the rights of the universal Church. We accept, however, with extreme satisfaction the confession forced from his lips that, owing to he does not know what prepossession, he cannot now attack Ultramontane doctrines, he cannot now, as there once was a time, discuss these grave questions without laying himself open to the suspicion of wishing to weaken the Catholic sentiment in France. M. Rouland is kind enough not to object to the Papal supremacy, however absolute, as long as it confines itself to purely spiritual questions; at this, indeed, he is not shocked, but when he reflects how the supremacy of the Holy See extends itself from

faith to dogma, from dogma to morals, from morals to purely temporal things, then, indeed, he is horrified at its consequences. He cites as a proof "of how easily such an absolute supremacy may arise, the twenty-fourth proposition of the Syllabus, which affirms as an evident truth that the Church has all power over princes, inasmuch as they are Christians." He finds fault with the clergy that so many of them are attached to the principles current under the pontificates of Gregory VII. and of Boniface VIII.; he is still more offended that some of them should venture to maintain that certain of the articles in the Declaration of 1682 are false, and injurious alike to common sense, to Revelation, and to the rights of the Church. We freely acknowledge our joy in hearing the Gallican ex-Minister of Public Worship declare openly before the French Senate, with a bitterness which he cannot conceal, that "the teaching of St. Sulpice has lost all its ancient traditions; that the most extreme doctrines are taught there now, and the young priests learn in it those new principles whence spring agitation and trouble of conscience; and that what is happening to-day in St. Sulpice is taking place in most of the seminaries of France. It is indisputable that, in these seminaries, the ancient doctrines of the French Church are now abandoned."

After such an acknowledgment, expressed in so many ways by M. Rouland in his speech, as to the almost universal prevalence in the Church of France of a true Catholic spirit and of a sound Catholic teaching, we are not in a humour to be very angry with him on account of his attack on the religious orders; we feel, after such a display of weakness as his, that the victory is on our side. They, therefore, who win may laugh. The spread of the monastic orders in France, which he deplures as an evil, and which he calls on the Government to check with the same firmness they have hitherto displayed, Catholics regard as a triumph. The ex-minister regrets that, in spite of their vow of poverty, riches are heaped on the religious orders by the zealous Catholics of France, so as to enable them to carry out their great works of charity and education. The speaker, although constrained to acknowledge the excellence of the moral and religious instruction in their schools, yet regretted the immense increase in their educational establishments, because their instruction laid the foundation of an antagonism in the hearts of their pupils, which, on the contrary, ought to be made to disappear in the interests of the future. This antagonism against the prevailing spirit of infidelity in France, against the corruptions of worldliness, or against the expiring theories of an effete Gallicanism, which M. Rouland rightly attributes to the influence of monastic teaching, and which he regrets as a fatal source of future dissension, Catholics look upon as the chief merit of the religious orders. What can be said of an ex-minister of public worship when he describes the spirit of zeal for religion and for the Catholic faith, which the monastic orders are introducing into France, as too ascetic and too devout not to be far removed from true piety. He has gained, by such an insinuation against the integrity and self-sacrifice so conspicuous in the convents and monasteries, an applause and a support which even a Gallican exponent of Imperial policy cannot be proud of. His speech was frequently interrupted by calls for "the execution of the laws against the Jesuits," and for the "expulsion of the religious orders, as is now being done in Italy." But, after all, the true motive of the Gallican ex-minister's animosity against the regular clergy breaks out at last when he denounces them "as being looked upon by Ultramontanism as one of its principal elements of strength." This accusation redounds to their credit and honour, and is one of the causes why the monastic orders are always so dear to Catholic hearts. It is needless to allude to the way in which M. Rouland labours to excite jealousy between the secular and regular clergy, or in which he describes the lower clergy as driving on, under the impulse of the Ultramontane spirit, their

episcopal superiors to unaccustomed and unwelcome paths, or as giving their bishops the go-by, and appealing from their authority direct to Rome. It is superfluous, also, to notice the charges which the speaker flung about in the French Senate against the religious orders, as being insubordinate and opposed to the bishops, over whom, confident of the support of Rome, they tyrannized; or, what was worse, acted the base part of spies and informers. He even went so far as to pity the condition to which he alleged the French bishops were reduced. Set at defiance by their own clergy, deprived by Rome of their just measure of authority, and suspected by the Ultramontane party on account of its traditions and memories, which reached back to 1682, he invoked on behalf of the down-trodden and humiliated Episcopate of France the sympathy of the Senate and the aid of the State. But all such sympathy was repulsed as uncalled for and insulting, and all such aid and State interference repudiated with a noble indignation by the Cardinals and Archbishops present, who frequently interrupted the vehement speaker with protests and emphatic disavowals.

After describing the recent change in the Liturgy, as prompted by the desire of extinguishing the last remnants of Gallicanism, and after denouncing the Congregation of the Index, he concluded his speech as he had begun it, by a violent denunciation of the teachings of the Catholic Church, which he is in the habit of disguising under the name of Ultramontanism. He regretted again that he could not speak to-day as his ancestors had spoken without ceasing to be a good Catholic. "Are," he asked, "things now so changed that the language of our fathers is no more understood?" He acknowledged that his speech was a denunciation of Ultramontanism, but he was deeply moved by the public disobedience to the law shown by the bishops in the matter of the Encyclical and of the Syllabus; but such an act of episcopal insubordination against the civil power he looked upon but as one incident of a vast system set on foot by a powerful party. His denunciation, therefore, was the denunciation of a public evil, the exposition of an abuse which it was incumbent on the conscience of every one to know, and which it was the duty of the State to put down in the interests of the public peace and of the alliance between religion and the civil power.

In answer to the unnumbered and vehement attacks levelled in France against the Catholic Church since the publication of the Encyclical Letter and the Syllabus, in answer to the circular of M. Baroche to the dispatches of M. Drouyn de Lhuys, to the Imperial speech at the opening of the Chambers, and to the debates in the French Senate, we have arrayed in a compact mass the noble declarations of the Episcopate of France. With a wonderful unanimity and forwardness, which give the lie to the insinuations contained in M. Rouland's speech, they have not only given in their cordial adherence to the Encyclical Letter of the Pope, but they have been prompt in explaining its dogmatic decisions and the condemned propositions of the Syllabus to the clergy of their dioceses. Starting from various points, cardinals, archbishops, bishops, and the administrators of vacant sees, to the number of eighty-two, have published in France their explanation of the Dogmatic Bull; and yet in this vast collection there is no divergence of opinion as to any matter of importance, no symptoms of disaffection against the Holy See, no doubt expressed as to its wisdom, far less as to its competency, in condemning such matters as it has condemned. In regard to the restrictions imposed by the jealousy of the civil power on the bishops in the discharge of their spiritual office, they have acted with a boldness and a unity of purpose, though various in its execution, worthy of their high calling. Some, in spite of official prohibition, have, like the Bishop of Moulins and the Archbishop of Besançon, read the Encyclical and the Syllabus from the pulpit of their cathedral.

The vast majority, in letters to the Minister of Public Worship, have protested against the infringement of the rights of the Church by the State, and

have declared their determination to make its contents known to all their clergy, in compliance with the orders of the Holy See ; none, finally, have refused obedience to the Holy See.

By this act of obedience, or rather of affection and loyalty, to the Holy See, on the part of the Episcopate of France, they have given a complete answer to the calumnies of their enemies, they have strengthened the hands of the Holy Father at a most perilous crisis, and have offered an example of wisdom and courage to the whole of Europe.

"Such an exhibition of unity and of profound convictions as is displayed by the Episcopate of France in their pastorals and pamphlets, and speeches in the Senate, will do much to convince, not only France, but Europe, as to the impossibility of any compromise between the principles of the Papacy and those of the Revolution.

In vain does M. Rouland, the Gallican, attack the Church of France for its fidelity to Rome ; in vain does M. Rouher, the Minister of Public Worship, adjure the French bishops to intervene at Rome in the interests of a great reconciliation between the temporal and spiritual powers. To no purpose does he hurl defiance against the revolution in Italy, and with fair words advise Rome to surrender. The French Episcopate, in the spirit of the Encyclical, refuse all compromise, all reconciliation on a false basis. Cardinal de Bonnechose would rather see the Pope an exile in the land of the stranger than that he should surrender one jot or tittle of his rights, or sacrifice principle to political expediency.

The Pope himself, in a letter addressed to the Bishop of Orleans, describes the French bishops "as setting aside every human consideration and braving every risk," as having, "nearly all, defended with sacerdotal constancy and freedom before the high ministers of the Empire the violated rights of the Holy See," and as having "endeavoured to warn the faithful committed to their charge of the dangers of the errors condemned in the Encyclical," and as "execrating them in the same sense in which they had been reprobated at Rome."

In reference to the celebrated pamphlet of Mgr. Dupanloup, the Pope speaks in such terms of cordial yet discriminating praise as call for the most thoughtful consideration. "Eagerly perusing," writes his Holiness, "this work, we see not without pleasure that thou hast not only collected and condemned to well-merited contempt the calumnies and errors of the newspapers, but severely reprov'd the injurious prohibition by which, leaving to presumptuous and inimical writers licence of discussion, it is sought to deprive the sole legitimate interpreters of our letters, to whom besides they were addressed, of the faculty of publishing and explaining the same.

"And we are principally gratified with the enumeration of the wicked and arrogant machinations and frauds, acts of destruction and cruelty that, supported by the testimony of indubitable and public facts, thou hast set before the eyes of all in the first part of thy work, in order to manifest the intentions of those to whose illustrious guardianship, under the convention of the 15th of September last, it was thought proper to confide the remnant of the spoils and the sacredness of our rights. We therefore testify to thee the gratitude of our soul, taking for granted that thou, from the zeal with which thou art accustomed to defend the cause of religion and truth, wilt explain to thy people the true sense of our letters the more studiously and accurately, in proportion as thou hast more vehemently exploded the calumnious interpretations given to the same. But while we augur for thee ample recompense of this study, in token thereof, and in testimony of our special goodwill, we lovingly bestow upon thee and upon all thy diocese our apostolic benediction.

"Given at St. Peter's, at Rome, the 4th of February, 1865.

"In the 19th year of our Pontificate."

VOL. IV.—NO. VIII. [*New Series.*]

2 Q

The bishops of Italy, too, regard this great question of principle in the same light ; and though they live under a government which made a boast of having instituted that which Cardinal Bonnechose well describes as the greatest of falsehoods, a free Church in a free State, they were not able to publish their agreement with such principles, at least in the first instance, without incurring penalties such as never could have been inflicted on bishops in France. The Bishop of Mondovi was condemned by the Piedmontese tribunals to three and a half months' imprisonment for having, in the exercise of his episcopal rights, published the Papal Encyclical. And even at the present moment, though now the publication of the Papal Bull is officially permitted, legal proceedings have been instituted against the Bishop of Bergamo in consequence of some remarks in the pulpit which were deemed hostile to the institutions of the revolutionary state of Italy. Considering the disaffection which exists in the Italian populations, and considering the protests which had been presented by the Tuscan and Piedmontese prelates and other episcopal protests which were coming in from all parts of Italy, and considering the fact that the King, at the time, had been obliged to fly in disgrace from Turin, it was an act of prudence, on the part of the Sardinian Government, to withdraw its prohibition against the Papal Bull, since a still further persecution of the bishops, or an exhibition, as in France, of their determination to uphold the rights of the Church and the cause of the Papacy, might have precipitated the fall of the tottering kingdom of Italy. The discontent is not confined to Turin, nor does it spring from temporary causes. Cardinal de Bonnechose described, in the French Senate, Italy as it is in reality, as a country with a failing agriculture, a languishing commerce, the fine arts in a state of stagnation, where the development of genius is checked by absence of all security ; and the Church is oppressed in a most shameful manner. "I myself have seen," said the Cardinal, "how the Church is persecuted. Forty episcopal sees are vacant ; the bishops cannot communicate with their flocks ; ecclesiastical vocations are drained in their source by conscription ; bishops are no more free to choose their own priests, they have not even the liberty of theological instruction. Shall I speak," he continues, "of individual persecutions, of bishops thrown into prison,* where they have died without trial. I have seen the venerable Archbishop of Turin exiled ; the Archbishop of Cagliari driven from his diocese and dying in Rome ; Cardinal Corsi, the Archbishop of Pisa, dragged to Turin to account for his conduct, and Cardinal d'Angelis, Archbishop of Fermo, kept out of his diocese for five years." Though persecution has thinned the ranks of the Italian bishops, it has not daunted their courage, nor shaken their devotedness to Rome. They have entered into the spirit of the Encyclical, many of them have fully explained it in all its bearings, and though perhaps not to the same extent as in France, the Papal Bull has in Italy received so far a zealous acceptance at the hands of the bishops.

In Spain, some of the liberal statesmen who are at the head of the Government were desirous of forbidding the publication of the Encyclical, but their desires were frustrated, and the Papal Bull was officially promulgated, with the reservation, nevertheless, of certain rights alleged to be appertaining to the Crown. The old Bourbon leaven still ferments in Spain, in spite of the many severe trials and frequent revolutions the country has had to undergo. The bishops are doing their duty by the Pope ; the Church in Spain is exposed to fewer external dangers than in most countries in Europe ; but it is to be hoped that the Papal Letter will excite, what is much needed, a new spirit of fervour and

* We here call to the mind of our readers the state of the Piedmontese prisons, as described by Lord H. Lennox, in the House of Commons, the Session before last.

of religious energy in that old Catholic land. Portugal, which, of all European countries, stands in most need of a cure, refuses the Divine Physician. Triumphant liberalism holds the country in the deepest degradation. Masonic priests, and bishops who hold their sees by the favour of the lodges, lord it over the Church. There is, unhappily, no prospect of a better future, even in the Episcopal seminaries. The good old monks are fast dying out, and there are none to take their place. In the secular priests the people have no confidence, and it must be confessed too frequently with reason. Up to the 7th of February not one of the bishops of Portugal had spoken on the Encyclical. It is a matter of regret, not of surprise; for it is but natural that rebellious pride should kick against the Divine goad.

In Belgium, of course, there has been no obstacle whatsoever to the publication of the Encyclical. The chief difficulty the Belgian bishops have to contend against is to defend the Papal condemnations against that spirit of misrepresentation and fierce hostility which has been fostered, if not engendered, by the godless institutions of the country. Another difficulty which is being imposed upon Catholics is the reconciliation of the principles of the Belgian constitution with those enunciated in the Encyclical. For such Catholics as have no respect for the principles of the Belgian constitution, and have never professed an extravagant admiration for the godless system it sanctions, of universal liberty for all worships and for all opinions, it is an easy task to accept the Belgian constitution as a political necessity, and to abide by the principles of the Encyclical. But in themselves, we acknowledge the principles are irreconcilable.

The new hierarchy of Holland, like our own, has officially introduced the Encyclical, and in both countries it has been received by Catholics in a quiet and reverential spirit. We cannot here refrain from expressing our deep sorrow that in the death of the great English Cardinal before its promulgation, the Papal Encyclical has lost one of its most zealous defenders, and one who would have been so well able to set forth its meaning before his Protestant fellow-countrymen. The bishops in Switzerland have eagerly joined the ranks of the universal Episcopate in promulgating the Encyclical in their dioceses, and in recording their cordial adherence to its principles.

The Governments of the two great German nations have thrown no obstacles in the way of the promulgation of the Encyclical Letter. Since the Revolution of 1848, the Prussian constitution allows of free intercourse between Rome and the Catholic bishops of Prussia. The Government has consequently notified that it is not competent to take any notice of Papal Bulls or Briefs coming into the country; should such documents contain anything contrary to the laws of the Constitution, then only would they come under the cognizance of the Government, and be subject to the ordinary tribunals of the country.

The Austrian Government has officially published and placed in the archives of the empire the Encyclical, together with the Syllabus annexed to it, declaring, at the same time, that it contains no principles in conflict with those of the Austrian constitution. The relations between Austria and the Holy See are regulated by the Concordat of 1852, which gave perfect freedom to the Church throughout the empire. Papal documents are subject to no supervision, and so stand in need of no official authorization. None of the German governments, even those the most ill-affected towards Rome and most jealous of its authority, have ventured, as far as we know, to prohibit the publication of the Papal documents. One of the effects of the revolution of 1848 was to sweep away a whole host of vexatious and tyrannical laws which oppressed the Church in Germany and hampered its free action. It opened unrestricted communication with Rome; and although since then many of these shortsighted rulers, oblivious of the ruin they so narrowly escaped, have laboured to usurp authority over ecclesiastical matters, the

Church has been too strong to submit to such encroachments. The principles laid down in the Encyclical as to the relative positions of the Church and of the State will give new strength and courage to the bishops, even if they do not open the eyes of some of the misguided princes in the lesser states of Germany.

Some of the most eminent and learned of the German bishops have published important commentaries on the Encyclical and on the list of condemned propositions, showing a thorough appreciation of its spirit, analyzing and developing its principles with masterly skill. The most important commentary, perhaps, which has yet appeared in Germany is that of the Cardinal Archbishop of Vienna, which was published on the 25th of January, in the form of a pamphlet, entitled, "The State without God." With profound and comprehensive logic he traces the errors condemned by the Pope in their speculative and historic genesis, and in their deepest relations to the State, to the Church, and to the life of nations. To the Catholics of Austria, in many ways so tame and feeble, so often worldly-minded and cowardly in their judgment of things, Cardinal Rauscher has done great service by this bold and spirited publication. He speaks in his concluding remarks of the Pope as rising up in the midst of increasing danger against the errors with which the revolution in Italy and elsewhere seeks to justify its deeds and designs; errors which falsify faith and conscience—errors which dominate over the surface of European society with such boastful confidence as to make the mighty of the earth treat with them as with a power which no man dare break with. But not such is the conduct of the defenceless Pope. The Archbishop then endeavours to inspire men with courage. "Shall the sound," he asks, "of current phrases, which fall to nothing when probed to the bottom, be able to deter a man—an Austrian, a Christian—from openly avowing his convictions and acting up to them? What sickens by contradiction is rotten in its inmost core. Error, by its union with passion and cupidity, may take the appearance of strength; yet, if the courage of conviction meets it, it retreats like an *ignis fatuus*, which flies or pursues as a man advances or retires."

His advice, in a word, to the Catholics of Austria is to front, like the Pope the errors of the day, in which case he assures them an easy victory; but if they retreat before pompous phrases, he foretells their speedy destruction. Another commentary on the Encyclical, which, by its incisive outspokenness and concentrated power, is exciting no little attention, is that of the celebrated Bishop of Mayence, von Ketteler. He enters at once into the heart of the subject, designating, as the chief error condemned by the Pope, the separation, on principle, of the State and of society from God and the divine order of things, the making absolute the will of the State, that is, of man's will, as the sole and highest law, and the subjection of the school and of the family separated from the Church, as also of the individual as well as of the Church itself, to the absolutism of a godless State-omnipotence.

The Catholics of the Rhenish provinces and of the Palatinate, the most zealous of the Catholics of Germany, will well know how to appreciate this able production. The Bishop of Münster has also written on the subject of the Encyclical a pastoral letter, which is finding a ready response throughout Westphalia. In fact, one after another, the bishops are explaining and analyzing the principles of the Encyclical, so that the Catholics of Germany have a good opportunity of taking to heart the great lesson on faith, on philosophy, and on politics, which the Pope has just given to a rebellious world. The great Catholic periodicals have nobly done their duty on this occasion. The *Historisch-politische Blätter* of Munich has a paper of very high merit on the Encyclical quite worthy of the character of this great organ of Catholic opinion; and the *Katholik*, of Mayence, has had two masterly articles on the same subject, besides some collateral information which we have made use of in this summary. Several commentaries also have been published,—some of a more

popular, some of a more scientific character. The most copious and the most important is a work which has appeared in Vienna :—"The Pope and the Modern Ideas." The rapid appearance and circulation of such writings as these speak well for the German mind. There is, however, a strong undercurrent amongst Catholics in various parts of Germany against the religious movement, much disaffection against what are called Ultramontane principles, and in some instances not only secret or negative encouragement of anti-Catholic measures, but open resistance to the authority of the Church, as we shall have to show when we come to speak of the treatment which the bishops of Bavaria receive at the hands of the Government, and of the manner in which the rights of the Church are shamefully trampled underfoot in the matter of popular education in Baden. But, before doing so, we wish to point out one great effect of the Encyclical in Germany ; and that is, the way in which it has strengthened the hands and fortified the position of those who have long and ably defended the rights of the Church against the encroachments of a false science and the innovations of a liberal and rationalistic philosophy. In France, and Italy, and Belgium, Catholic attention has been more exclusively directed to the political aspects of the Encyclical, and to the propositions it lays down as to the relations between the Church and the State and civil society ; whereas in Catholic Germany the principles it inculcates concerning the relative positions of theology and of philosophy have excited more interest. In the whole domain of German literature no greater or more dangerous subtlety exists than in the attempt to invest philosophy with an independent authority, and to confine theology in the narrowest limits.

The result of this attempt has drawn down upon several Catholic writers, priests, and professors in German universities the condemnation of the Holy See. In the Encyclical of the 8th of December many of the condemned propositions, as readily appear on its perusal, were originally directed against theories first broached in Germany, and were published in Papal briefs addressed to German bishops. Not to speak of errors obstinately maintained in spite of the condemnation of the Holy See, there exists a school rash and extreme in its views, which aims at the creation of a German Catholic philosophy, founded on bases distinct from those of the scholastic philosophy. The supporters of this school profess no little contempt for the scholastic teaching, as unsuited to the progress of science, as un-German, and as tending to hamper the freedom of speculative inquiry. Against these propositions the modern-scholastic school, as it is called, which has its chief seat in Mayence, and its best public organ in the *Katholik*, has long maintained an able warfare. It accepts the modern improvements in scientific method, and welcomes the discoveries of science ; but it maintains that the new adaptations must be grafted on the old system, and modern philosophy must be raised on the old foundations. It denies, however, to philosophy unlimited freedom in its own sphere, and contends that science must be subject, not only in its ultimate results, but in the course of its speculative inquiries, to the conclusions of theology. It holds, in fine, as a first principle, that the divine illumination of faith is necessary to human reason in all its inquiries, and that philosophy finds its limits in theology. In a word, this theologico-philosophic school objects to such a revolutionizing scheme as would sweep away the old scholastic foundations, so long approved of by the Church, in order to raise an entirely new system on a modern basis. Between these two schools of opposite thinkers there exist, as is easily understood, many intermediate opinions. There are men of learning and influence, with a strong bias in favour of the modern German school of thought, who have endeavoured, but happily failed, to bring about a reconciliation on a temporizing basis. A narrow, local jealousy against the teaching of S. Thomas prevails to no small extent with some, and this contemptible weakness tends to widen philosophical differences already too great. An anti-

Roman, not to call it an anti-Papal, spirit still further kindles the fierceness of a dispute which requires no additional stimulant. These theologico-philosophic differences are familiar to all acquainted with German Catholic literature; they have long formed subjects of fierce controversy between Catholic theologians and philosophical writers in the universities. They were at the bottom of the divisions which came to light in the Munich congress. The importance of this controversy is well understood at Rome. The tendencies of the school which favours the innovations and assumptions of science, and fosters an independence in philosophy bordering on the rebellious, are clearly condemned by the principles laid down in the Encyclical Letter. In fact, for the full appreciation of some of the condemned prepositions, an acquaintance with the state of things in Catholic Germany is almost a necessity.

The Encyclical Letter has come in the nick of time for Germany. It is a tower of strength for the scholastic school. It is an authority against which there is no appeal. At the same time it is a light poured with concentrated force into the very depths of the dispute. Such a light cannot fail to clear up many obscurities, and lead men back from out the tangled thickets and dark mazes of a philosophic rationalism to the straight paths of faith and of true science. This is the time for a reconciliation of opposing systems on the only possible basis—an implicit obedience in all matters under dispute to the definitions and directions of the Holy See. In the errors as to the relations between faith and science there is a far subtler energy and a more dividing power than is found in the political derangements between the Church and the civil power. Yet these lesser errors are in full force in some parts of Catholic Germany, disturbing the harmony of civil life and subverting the public foundations of religion. In Catholic Bavaria the Encyclical has much need to be studied. First of all it requires the royal *Placet* to enter the country. When admitted, many of its principles are found to be in conflict with maxims which have too long obtained in the Bavarian bureaucracy, and have been too often carried out in practice by the Bavarian Government. Many of the religious orders are proscribed; not a Jesuit is allowed in Bavaria; the rights of the bishops are set aside; Catholic education is tampered with at the universities; Protestant or Rationalistic Professors are favoured, and Catholic professors, if of "Ultramontane" principles, are shelved, to the great moral detriment of the students, who thus early learn to be shy of adopting sound Catholic tenets. And finally, not to extend our catalogue of accusations, the provisions of the Concordat, concluded so far back as 1827 between the Bavarian Government and the Holy See, are systematically disregarded. Perhaps, on this and some other points the bishops have displayed a want of energy and resolution, so necessary under such a government, for the upholding of the rights of religion. In our last summary we recorded the fact that the Episcopal Seminary at Spire had been closed by the order of Government. The Bishop of Spire has since written a most able and excellent pastoral on the prohibition of theological instruction in his seminary. It is a firm vindication of his episcopal rights against the violence of the State. Indeed, since the imprisonment of the great Archbishop of Cologne by the Prussian Government, nothing more important has happened to the Church in Germany. By this measure, at Spire, the Bavarian Government has claimed as a right of the State the education of the clergy in theology. Should this principle, however, be enforced in Bavaria—hitherto such has not been the case—the Church would be reduced to a state of subjection, in violation of one of the first fundamental truths of the faith. "Were the Church in Bavaria," writes one of its defenders against this violent aggression, "ever itself to accept such a state of things, it would forfeit its claim to Catholicity, and degenerate into a mere State institution." The archbishops and bishops of Bavaria have, however, protested against the violent closing

of the Theological College in the Seminary at Spire, in a memorial presented to the king. In this memorial they declare that Article V. of the Concordat conferred on the Bishop of Spire the full and perfect right (*pleno liberoque jure*) over the management of his seminary. In accordance with this right, without even claiming, as he was entitled to do by the provisions of the Concordat, pecuniary assistance from the State, he opened, after having given due notice of his intention to the authorities, a theological college in the Seminary at Spire. This college, however, in spite of repeated protests on the part of the bishop and of the Apostolic Nuncio at Munich, was forcibly closed by the intervention of the police, in conformity with an order of the Government. The memorial then sets forth that the bishops feel it their duty to declare to his Majesty that they are perfectly of accord with the Bishop of Spire in this matter. They show that the independent management by the Bishop of theological studies in his seminary is a right based on a dogma of the Catholic Church, and in conformity with the statutes of the Council of Trent; that it is, moreover, a right solemnly guaranteed by the articles of the Concordat. They then formally recorded a protest against the principle put forth by the Government; namely, that, with the exclusion of the Bishop, it belonged to the State alone to charge itself with the training of the priests of the country; they protested not less against the forcible closure of the theological college of Spire, in which act they saw, not alone a violation of an inalienable and essential right of the universal Church, but also of rights secured by the Concordat and by the constitution of Bavaria.

In 1837, when the Church in Prussia was persecuted by the imprisonment of the famous Archbishop of Cologne, the Catholics of Bavaria presented a noble phalanx of defenders of the rights and of the liberties of the Church in Germany. But now, since the Catholic leadership and the custody of Catholic principles have passed over from Bavaria to the Catholics of the Rhine, it is incumbent on the latter, both as a duty and as a debt of gratitude, to come forward in defence of the violated rights of the Church in Bavaria.

The grand duchy of Baden, too, is fixing on itself, by its conduct towards the Church, the eyes, not only of Germany, but of Catholic Europe.

The cause of the conflict between the Church and the Government of the grand duchy of Baden is the assertion by the civil power of those identical errors touching popular education which are condemned in the 47th proposition of the Syllabus. This condemnation was conveyed in a Papal Letter of the 14th of July, 1864, to the zealous and venerable Archbishop of Freiburg. The Archbishop himself and all his clergy, backed by the people, have exerted all the power which the Constitution allows to arrest the proposed change in the laws on popular education. The Bill brought forward by the Government in the Baden Chambers proposes such an alteration in the existing laws as will amount to the introduction of a godless system of education in the popular schools.

A gratuitous, a compulsory, and an irreligious education is what the liberalism of Baden desiderates. In the consideration of these questions, it must not be forgotten that a godless liberalism has promoted, of late years, throughout Germany, the transfer of rationalistic teachers from their professorial chairs to the seats of the Chambers and to the ministerial benches, in order that they might carry out, in the practical work of legislation and government, the theories they had taught so long and with such success in the various universities of their country.

Deputations from all parts of the country have presented to the Grand Duke petitions against the proposed measure. The Grand Duke has refused to receive any more deputations on the subject; but as the constitution confers the right of presenting petitions, the national demonstration is kept up. Large committees move about the country, convoke meetings in every corner of the

grand duchy, and organize deputations. A meeting of such a description was recently interrupted at Mannheim by the violence of the liberals, who are labouring to get up a counter-agitation in the interests of the government scheme. In passing over the bridge, the members of the committee were assaulted; the head of one priest was cut open by a stone, another was thrown down and trampled on by the liberal mob; and a cry was raised by those infuriated or corrupt men to fling the priests into the Rhine. The police had to interfere, and the meeting was broken up. The agitation is spreading through the country. On the excited and prejudiced minds of those to whom unhappily the Government of Baden is entrusted the calm words of Pius IX. and his clear definitions of the relative rights of the Church and the civil power fall without effect.

In following the Encyclical Letter across the Atlantic, we find that its teaching is set at defiance, not only in a South American republic like Granada, but in the new kingdom of Mexico itself. The Emperor Maximilian is too busily engaged in enacting decrees against the liberty, the independence, and the rights of the Church, in confiscating its property, in reviving the old Spanish-American laws against the temporal power which the Holy See possesses in every Catholic nation, to notice or to care that the principles of government which he is inaugurating are condemned by the Encyclical Letter of the 8th December. He prefers the study of Josephist theories or of Gallican traditions, as to the relations between the Church and the civil powers, to that of the Syllabus of condemned propositions. "The measures," says a liberal paper* whose hostile criticisms pursue the Church in every quarter of the globe, "recently taken by the Emperor of Mexico touching the management of the ecclesiastical affairs of his empire have won the approbation of all the liberal journals of the Old and of the New World, not because they are themselves irreproachable on liberal principles, but because they show at least a desire, on the part of the new sovereign, to maintain his complete independence in regard to the clergy, and not to submit to the haughty demands of the Court of Rome." But by this attitude towards the Church and towards the Holy See the Emperor has forfeited the confidence of the Papal Nuncio and of the Mexican Episcopate. The negotiations with Rome, which the Nuncio was commissioned to conduct, have been broken off. Meantime, the worst laws are put in force. The Archbishop of Mexico has protested against the execution by the new Government of the revolutionary decrees of Juarez, and has reminded the Emperor that, as a Christian prince, he was a subject of the Sovereign Pontiff. But the Emperor turns a deaf ear even to the confidential admonishment of the Pope himself. On the 8th of October last, a private letter, written by the Pope, was presented to the Emperor Maximilian by the Apostolic Nuncio, M. Meglia, in which were laid down the bases of such a settlement of ecclesiastical affairs as seemed to the Pope good and desirable. "In this letter," says an adverse critic, "we find again the true language of the Encyclical." It speaks, indeed, in the spirit of the Encyclical, the noble language of truth to the Emperor, on the duties he owes to the Church and to the nation he is called upon to rule over. Pope Pius reminds the Emperor Maximilian of the joy with which his accession to the throne was hailed by a people who had, up to that time, to groan under the yoke of an anarchical government, and to mourn over the ruins and disasters of the Catholic religion—its chief glory in all times, and the foundation of all its prosperity. He reminds the emperor of his promises to protect the Church, and laments that the laws which oppressed religion were still unrepealed; that sacred and monastic edifices were still being destroyed or converted to other uses; that monks were not allowed to assume again the habits of their

* *Indépendance Belge.*

order and to live in community ; that the journals were still permitted to insult the pastors and attack the doctrines of the Church, to the great scandal of the faithful and to the injury of religion. The following paragraph of the Pope's letter prescribing to the Emperor the course which he ought to pursue under existing circumstances in regard to the Church, is in itself so important, and has been so much the subject of attack, that we give it in full :—" Your Majesty," says his Holiness, " knows very well that to repair in an efficacious manner the evils occasioned by the revolution, and the sooner to bring back to the Church happy times, it is, before all things, necessary that the Catholic religion, to the exclusion of every other dissenting worship, continue to be the glory and the support of the Mexican nation ; that the bishops be entirely free in the exercise of their sacred ministry ; that the religious orders be re-established and reorganized, in conformity with the instructions and powers which we have given ; that the patrimony of the Church and the rights which attach to it be safeguarded and protected ; that none be permitted to teach and publish false and subversive principles ; that instruction, both public and private, be under the direction and supervision of the ecclesiastical authorities ; and that, finally, the chains be broken which have hitherto kept the Church in dependence on the will of the civil Government. If the religious edifice be re-established on such bases, of which we do not wish to doubt, your Majesty will give satisfaction to one of the greatest wants, to one of the liveliest aspirations of a people so religious as that of Mexico ; you will calm our anxieties and those of the illustrious Episcopate of Mexico ; you will prepare the way for the education of a learned and zealous clergy, as well as to the moral reform of your subjects ; and, moreover, you will give a striking example to the other Governments of the American republics, where such lamentable trials have fallen upon the Church ; and, finally, you will thus, without doubt, contribute much to the consolidation of your own throne, and to the glory and to the prosperity of the Imperial family." This noteworthy lesson as to the duties of a Catholic government preceded the publication of the Encyclical, but uses the same decided language. But its teaching, so personal and conciliatory, as well as the principles publicly laid down in the Encyclical, have been thrown away on the Emperor Maximilian. He has lost the approval of the Pope and of the Mexican Church and people, but he has gained the applause of General Florey in the French Senate for his unexpected and uncatholic liberalism, and the praise of all the anti-christian journals, and of all the enemies of the Pope and of his magnificent Encyclical on either Continent.

But whatever may be the criticisms and the interpretations of the Encyclical on either side of the Atlantic, in Rome we may be sure to find the true explanation of its meaning. Hence the importance which attaches to the letter which the Cardinal Vicar has published on that subject. The object which the Encyclical had in view (says the Cardinal Vicar) was to save society, threatened with great dangers, and revolutionized by the spirit of error which is abroad, and which is striving to shake society to its foundations, in order to lead it back to that barbarism from which it was once rescued by the light of the Gospel. " In the Encyclical," continues the Cardinal Vicar, " which his Holiness has recently addressed to the bishops, besides reciting the principal errors which he had already condemned in various briefs issued during his pontificate, he denounces other most pernicious errors, introduced into the world by men who had graduated in iniquity ; some of which it is incumbent on us to point out to you. Among those errors, some tend to deny to religion all influence over human society. Others claim an ill-omened liberty of conscience and of worship as a right to be secured by law to each individual ; they go even so far as to affirm the pretended right innate in every man, of publishing by the press, or by other means, the most strange and erroneous doctrines. From these false princi-

ples this consequence arises, that an attempt is being made to erect into all but a supreme law the will of the people, and the so-called public opinion, in virtue of which every act, howsoever iniquitous and unjust, from the very circumstance that it has become an accomplished fact, shall form a right against which there is to be no appeal."

It is natural to seek in the Cardinal Vicar's commentary the most exact interpretation of the Papal document. But whether authoritatively and strictly interpreted, or loosely explained and softened down, the Encyclical will still be a scandal and a stumbling-block to many. There is no help for it. All that we want is, that the meaning of the text should not be warped to suit any interests, or to escape no matter what criticisms. Some of the German commentators on the Encyclical and the Syllabus of condemned errors warn the Catholic public to be on their guard against any attempt to rub off the rough edges, or to soften down what to some minds may appear difficulties, in the Papal text. In the German Catholic translations and commentaries which we have seen, there is a scrupulous exactitude apparent, not only in reproducing the text, but in following out the spirit of the original. That is just what is needed for the guidance of the Catholic people. They want the Papal Bull in all its fulness, and explained in all its bearings—nothing less and nothing more. One effect, however, of the Encyclical, whatever else may happen, is to drive things on to their ultimate decision. It has already given a marvellous impulse to the sifting and separating process which is going on in the world. Its sharp dividing lines are penetrating into the substance of things. The issue none can foretell. But one thing is clear—whoever is not with the Encyclical is against God. We have only to rejoice, that in this grand definition of principles, in this Encyclical, which has added a fresh glory to the ever-memorable 8th of December, God has given a new strength and a new light to an unsettled generation and to a dark age. In the jubilee Catholics have an opportunity of testifying their gratitude; and in the last of the Papal utterances, with which the time abounds, in his answer to the address of the laity in Rome, Pius IX. declares that what is most necessary for us in these times of trial is the union of an exclusive faith with an expansive charity.

We cannot better conclude this notice of so great an event as the Encyclical than by giving the Pope's reply to the address presented to him by the foreign Catholic laity now residing in Rome.

"Every day brings more strongly to our remembrance the prayer made on behalf of His disciples before He ascended into heaven by the Divine Saviour of the human race, our Lord Jesus Christ. He prayed that they might be one with Him, as He and His Father are one. Every day the bishops of the whole Catholic world, as rays which, from the circumference, are traced back to the centre of the system, give fresh proof of their union with this supreme Chair. Another effect of this same prayer is your presence here; representing, as you do, so many different countries of the world. This union is one of faith and of charity—of faith, which unites intelligence in the one doctrine which Christ has revealed to His Church. Faith is one, as is the sun, and shines resplendently as the one source of light to the Christian world. It admits of no compromise or question, and is by its nature exclusive, as charity is expansive. For it the blood of martyrs and holy virgins has flowed; through it and for it shone the fortitude and courage of confessors; and, as faith is exclusive, so, as I have said, charity is expansive; and by charity I do not mean mere human friendship, or philanthropy, or romanticism, still less a compromise for the sake of peace between truth and error. The charity of which I speak is heavenly, and consists in loving our neighbours for the sake of God; and, as it has principally in view the eternal interests of immortal souls, it is necessarily severe upon error, while full of tenderness for those who err; and therefore we, who are divinely established

upon this seat" (here his Holiness indicated by a gesture the throne on which he sat), "are obliged by the necessity of our office to raise our voice as occasion may require, in condemnation of the errors of the nations. And you have done well to say that it is necessary (at least in the present order of things as established by Divine Providence) that there should be a spot where this Holy See can raise its voice to teach and to warn, without fear of the opposition of the powers of this world. There are those, it is true, who dispute this right of the Vicar of Jesus Christ. There are those who, in order to despoil him of it, cover him with outrage and calumny, both by word and by the pen. But to calumny I will only reply by my prayers—to spoliation by benediction—imploing Almighty God that all these may return to the faith, and re-enter into unity. Ask it also in your prayers, together with me, that all being united here through the whole earth in faith and in love, may give glory, with the Son, to God the Father throughout a blessed eternity.

"And now" (here his Holiness rose and raised his eyes to heaven) "it only remains for me to lift up my voice to Heaven, and to beseech the eternal Trinity to ratify the benediction which I bestow upon you out of the fulness of my heart.

"May God bless you now and at the hour of your death, and that you may expire with the most holy name upon your lips; may God bless you in your souls; may God bless you in your families; may God bless you in your native lands. *Benedictio Dei omnipotentis, Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti, descendat super vos, et maneat semper. Amen.*"

. In an article on the Belgian Constitution and the Church, in the last number of this Review, we showed how repugnant to Catholic teaching were the principles on which the Belgian constitution was based, and we attributed its adoption by the Catholic members of the National Assembly in 1830 to the unfortunate prevalence among them of political theories which are theologically unsound. The Encyclical of the 8th of December has confirmed us in the opinions we then expressed, inasmuch as one of the chief errors which it condemns is the separation of civil society, of the school, and of the individual from the control of religion. Such a separation, as regards the former, is the necessary result of such a constitution as the Belgian, an essential part of which is the substitution of civil for Divine laws in all matters affecting society. We would not have recurred to this subject were it not for a letter in the *Weekly Register* of the 18th of February from Mr. H. W. Willberforce, in which he asserts that the writer of the article on the Belgian Constitution and the Church "exaggerates the declarations and misapplies the censures of the Holy See." "This article," he commences his letter by saying, "traces all the religious and political evils of Belgium to the constitution of 1830, and assumes that it was condemned by Gregory XVI. by the Encyclical *Mirari vos*." Now, this short sentence contains two misapprehensions. At p. 174 of the article in question we stated, no doubt, that "the constitution of 1830 is, if not the chief, at least one of the causes which contributed to the evils of Belgium," but we nowhere stated that it was the sole cause. Secondly, we neither assumed nor implied that Gregory XVI., by the Encyclical *Mirari vos*, had condemned the constitution of 1830, but only the principle which led to its establishment. This distinction is most intelligible and most important. A Catholic may think that, under certain miserable circumstances, the total divorce of Church and State is a less evil than any other feasible alternative. We might or might not agree with this opinion; but we should never dream of alleging that it was condemned by Gregory XVI. or by any other Pope. But

it is one thing to accept such a constitution, and quite another thing to make a boast of it, or hold it up to the world as a model. What we complained of was that, not infidels, but Catholics, under the influence of false liberal theories, rejoiced in a constitution which is their country's disgrace. And we also expressed our own firm conviction that, in the particular case of Belgium, a far better alternative was feasible. Against the facts which we brought forward to show, in 1817 and 1827, how great was the preponderance of the Catholic party, Mr. Wilberforce has nothing to allege beyond a subjective proof, which may, perhaps, satisfy himself, but certainly no one else. "If the parties," he writes, "had then (1830) come into collision, I am inclined to believe that the relative strength of the infidel party would be greater than it is now." He has given us no means of making any reply, except that we are quite convinced he is altogether mistaken. Mr. Wilberforce proceeds to ask what is the practical mischief of such a constitution to counterbalance the good which it has conferred in giving liberty to the Church. We reply that this liberty might have been most easily obtained at a price immeasurably less than the introduction of that unspeakable calamity, political atheism. The period of thirty years, which has since elapsed, is far too short to give us even the faintest indication of the appalling results which must ultimately flow from that monster evil, if (which God forbid!) it remain unchecked. But even now we can point at the infidel universities, the anti-Christian marriage law, the irreconcilable and ever-increasing antagonism between Church and State.

In Belgium, unfortunately, before the appearance of the Encyclical of Gregory XVI., false ideas as to the relations between the Church and civil society, and as to the rights of man to an unrestricted liberty, were fostered by Catholics and paraded before the world. Unfortunately, in Belgium in 1830 there was an opportunity to put such theories into practice, and the result thereof is the godless system sanctioned by the Belgian constitution. Mr. Wilberforce professes his implicit adherence to the Papal Encyclical; let him, then, condemn with us that false liberalism which has conducted so much to the existing state of things in Belgium, rather than attempt to palliate the evil.

INDEX.

ACTA S.S., D.N., PII PP. IX., *noticed*, 533.

Allies (T. W.), *The Formation of Christendom*, *noticed*, 547.

Allingham (William), Laurence Bloomfield in Ireland, *reviewed*, 320, 323.

Amherst (Bishop), *Verbum in Corde Optimo—Fructus in Patientia*, a Sermon, *noticed*, 556.

Anthony of Padua (Saint), *The Life of*, *noticed*, 245.

Assemblée Générale des Catholiques en Belgique, *reviewed*, 171-192.

Association for promoting the Unity of Christendom, 227-230.

BELGIAN (THE) CONSTITUTION AND THE CHURCH, 171-192 : Infidel character of the Belgian Constitution, 171 ; the religious orders and episcopate, 172, 174 ; origin, history, and character of the Constitution, 174-182 ; the Constitution separates Belgium from its Catholic antecedents, 182 ; compared with the French Concordat, 183, 184 ; actual position of the Church in Belgium, 185, 187 ; the Belgian Catholics and Liberals, 188, 189 ; duties of Catholics and conduct of the Church towards the Constitution, 190, 191 ; its fundamental vice, 192.

Bellarmino on Political Society, 282.

Bonhomme (Honoré), *Madame de Maintenon et sa Famille*, *reviewed*, 70-107.

Breviarium Romanum, *reviewed*, 1-20.

CAIRNES (J. E.), *The Slave Power*, *reviewed*, 328, 372.

Campion (Father), *Memoirs of*, by P. Possoz, 549.

CARDINAL WISEMAN'S SERMONS, 192-213 : Character of the style and habit of thought of these Sermons, 192, 193 ; illustrative passages, 194-201 ; identity of character in all the Cardinal's work, 202, 203 ; his mission in England, 204 ; tendencies of England towards the Church, 204, 205 ; general Catholic reaction throughout Europe, 205, 206 ; political circumstances affecting Catholics, 206, 207 ; the Oxford movement, 207, 208 ; Doctor Wiseman's arrival in England, 209 ; his articles in the DUBLIN REVIEW, 209 ; contrast of the Oxford movement with the association of prayer for the unity of Christendom, 209-211 ; fixity and Roman character of the Cardinal's work.

CAUSES AND OBJECTS OF THE WAR IN AMERICA, 328, 372 : Summary view of the works of Professor Cairnes, Mr. Rawlins, and Lord Lothian, 328, 335 ; origin of the Republican Party, 336 ; the Missouri Compromise, 337, 338 ; the case of Kansas, 338, 342 ; the position of California, 343, 344 ; fundamental fallacy of English opinion regarding the Secession, 344, 345 ; Union actually governed by the South for eighty years, 345, 346 ; position of the Federal Government when Secession occurred,

347; calculations of the leaders of both sections, 348, 349; contemplated revival of the African slave trade, 350, 352; actual position of the slave trade at the time, 353, 355; intentions of the Confederate leaders in that respect, 356, 358; doctrine of the American courts touching slavery, 359, 360; the Dred Scott case, 360, 362; Mr. Buchanan's last months of administration, 362; Professor Cairnes' view of the situation of the Slave Power, 363; exhausting tendency of slave labour, 364, 365; real question at issue between North and South, 367, 368; recent legislation in favour of the negro, 368, 370; change of feeling in Northern States, 370, 371; prospects of a speedy conclusion of the war, 371, 372.

Church Establishment in Ireland (The), *reviewed*, 107-125.

Civiltà Cattolica, March 19 and April 2, 1864; Dr. Döllinger and the Munich Congress, 214-226.

Colenso (Dr.), The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined, 1.

Coleridge (Dr.), his Life of Suarez, 557.

Conolly (Rev. James), Sermon in Memory of Cardinal Wiseman, *noticed*, 556.

CONSALVI'S MEMOIRS, 396-423: character and writings of M. Cretineau-Joly, 396; general character of his memoirs of Cardinal Consalvi, 397; the Cardinal's testamentary dispositions, 398; his birth, family, and early career, 399, 401; fall of the Pope's Government and imprisonment of Consalvi, 401, 402; his secret visit to the Pope at the Chartreuse, 403, 404; death of Pius VI. and election of Pius VII., 404, 405; entry of the Pope to Rome, 406; first overtures of Napoleon touching a Concordat, 406; conduct of M. Cacault, 407; Consalvi sent to Paris, 408, 410; his first conversations with Napoleon, 410; state reception, 411; negotiation of the Concordat, 412; fraud attempted by Napoleon, 413, 414; the renewed discussion, 415; angry interview with the First Consul, 416; the questions in debate, 417, 419; Napoleon's real views as revealed in the Memorial of St. Helena, 419, 420; the lesson of Consalvi's character, 422, 423.

Cretineau-Joly (J.), *Mémoires du Cardinal Consalvi*, *reviewed*, 396, 423.

Croiset (Père), *La Vie de la Bienheureuse Marguerite-Marie*, *noticed*, 556, 557.

DANIEL (Père), Introduction to P. Croiset's *Vie de la Bienheureuse Marguerite-Marie*, 556.

Da Ponte's *Mysteries of Our Holy Faith*, *reviewed*, 1-20.

De Beaulieu (Count), *L'Erreur Libre dans l'État Libre*, *noticed*, 543.

Derby (Edward, Earl of), *The Iliad of Homer rendered into English blank verse*, *noticed*, 553, 556.

De Ségur (Mgr.), *Les Objections Populaires contre l'Encyclique*, *noticed*, 537, 538.

De Vere (Aubrey), *Inisfail*, *reviewed*, 323, 327.

Dr. Döllinger and the Munich Congress, 214-226; Dr. Döllinger's views of the state of philosophical and theological science in Spain, Italy, France, 214, 215; review of his statements, 215-217; actual state of philosophy and theology in Spain, France, and Italy, 217-219; the Index and

modern Italian theologians, 219, 220; Dr. Döllinger's views of the theological position of Germany, 220, 221; proofs of his position, 222, 223; actual contribution of Germany to Catholic letters, 224; German philosophy, 225; the only true philosophy to be found in the *Summa* of Saint Thomas, 226.

Dupanloup (Mgr.), *Discours sur l'Enseignement Populaire*, 234-239.

ENCYCLICAL AND SYLLABUS, The, 441, 499: Peculiar fertility of the present Pontificate in doctrinal declarations, 441, 442; contrast between the present Encyclical and the "Mirari Vos," 442, 443; authority of the Encyclical over a Catholic's interior convictions, 443, 447; infallibility of declarations attending the Pope as universal teacher, 447, 449; general analysis of the Encyclical, 450, 454; summary of special propositions condemned therein, 454, 455; general analysis of the Syllabus from Prop. i. to xiv., 456, 459; the propositions affecting Indifferentism, Latitudinarianism, 459; the salvability of non-Catholics, 459, 461; the limit of invincible ignorance, 461; character of Indifferentism, 462, 469; propositions bearing on the family and on civil society, 469, 472; character of the present struggle between Christian principles and revolutionary tenets, 472, 474; duties of Catholics with a view to the future developments of this struggle, 475, 477; Protestant misrepresentations, 479; Mgr. Mercurelli's letter to M. de Beaulieu, 479, 481; proportions from the fourth to the tenth class analyzed, 481, 490; doctrinal bearing of the censures contained in the Encyclical, 490, 493; the Church, mediæval ideas, and modern civilization, 493, 498; Cardinal Antonelli's circular to the Episcopate, 498, 499.

Encyclical and Syllabus, Text and Translation, 501, 530.

Encyclical and the Bishops of France, 536, 537.

EXTENT OF THE CHURCH'S INFALLIBILITY—THE ENCYCLICAL "MIRARI VOS," 41-69: Occasion of issuing the Encyclical, 41; limit of the doctrine that may be held touching the infallibility of the Holy See, 41, 42; the Church may pronounce infallibly on certain philosophical truths, 43, 44; ways in which the Holy Father usually promulgates lesser censures, 44, 45; evidence of theologians as to the Papal infallibility in such censures, 45; proposition that Papal declarations publicly addressed to the Church, for the purpose of inculcating doctrine or denouncing error, and accepted by the Episcopate expressly or tacitly, have the character of infallibility, 45; three reasons in support of this proposition, 45-50; qualifications of the proposition, 51; character of the doctrinal decrees of the Pontifical congregations, 52; objections to the general view, 52, 53; the "Mirari vos" an infallible condemnation, *ex cathedra*, of de Lammenais' system, 53; *résumé* of the controversy, from data furnished by de Lammenais himself, 54-58; analysis of the Encyclical, 58, 61; the doctrine compared with de Lammenais' theories, 61, 63; should Catholics, in consequence of this Encyclical, deny non-Catholic sects religious liberty? 63; the moral basis of civil government, 63, 64; the mediæval relation of Church and State the one normal relation, 65; the actual teaching of the Encyclical on the point of

religious liberty, 65, 66; liberty of the press, 66-68; further condemned errors of de Lammenais, 68; necessity at all hazards of discussing these questions, and vindicating the Papal infallibility in these times, 68, 69.

Ferguson (Samuel), *Lays of the Western Gael, and other poems, reviewed*, 307, 315.

Ffoulkes (Edward S.), *Christendom's Divisions, noticed*, 558, 559.

"Francis (Saint) and the Franciscans," Author of, 250.

GASPE (Philip A. de), *The Canadians of Old, noticed*, 248, 249.

Godard (M. l'Abbé Léon), *Les Principes de 89 et la Doctrine Catholique*, 279.

Gregorii XVI., P.P., *Epistola Encyclica "Mirari vos," reviewed*, 41-69.

Guizot (M.), *Meditations on the Essence of Christianity, noticed*, 240, 242.

HISTOIRE DE JULES CÉSAR, *noticed*, 550, 553.

History of Julius Cæsar, *noticed*, 550, 553.

Hoey (Cashel), *Essay on the Birthplace of S. Patrick, noticed*, 531, 532.

HOLY SCRIPTURE IN ITS CATHOLIC ASPECTS, 1-20: Result of taking the Bible as the sole rule of faith in Dr. Colenso's instance, 1; Apostle of Christianity to the Heathen converted into an Apostle of unbelief to his own country, 2; position of Catholics in regard to difficulties raised by Dr. Colenso, 3; Catholic view of God's Written Word, 3, 4; light thrown upon the Scriptures by the Liturgy and offices of the Church, and by meditation, 5, 6; the Old Testament as interpreted by the Church, 6; power of concentration exercised by the Church on the letter of Scripture, 7; analysis of the masses of Christmas Day, 7, 8; liturgical illustration of the Epiphany, 8; of the feasts of the Holy Name and of Corpus Christi, 9; application of the Psalms, 9, 10; Scripture language in the offices of the Saints, 10, 11; ordinary Protestant view of Scripture contrasted with Catholic view, 11; practical and devotional study of the Bible itself among Catholics, 11, 12; meditation, S. Bonaventure's Life of our Lord, S. Ignatius' exercises, 12, 13; Catholic and Protestant view of the character of our Blessed Lady, 13; her position as implied in the Scripture narrative, 14; the four great epochs of her life, 15; Scriptural indications of her office and prerogatives, 16, 17; a supernatural greatness assigned to her, 17; the Canticle of Canticles and the Apostolical Epistles, 18; the Catholic view as harmonizing all the parts of the Bible, 19; danger to faith of such books as Dr. Colenso's, 19; what our Lord said of Moses a warning to modern commentators, 20.

Hooper (George), *Waterloo; the Downfall of the First Napoleon, reviewed*, 141-170.

IRISH CHURCH ESTABLISHMENT, THE, 107-125; Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Fox on the Catholic clauses, 107, 108; arguments for the maintenance of the Irish Church Establishment considered, 108, 113; its practical

mischiefs, 113, 114 ; the case put as an *argumentum ad hominem* to the English and Scotch, 114, 116 ; growth of a better feeling in England on the subject, 117 ; case of Ireland, had she been treated on terms of equality, 118, 119 ; general injury to Imperial interests, 120, 121 ; testimonies of statesmen to the character of the Establishment and its effect on the condition of Ireland, 122, 125.

Irish Questions, the, considered, by R. D. O., *reviewed*, 423, 440.

LAMMENAIS (F.), *Œuvres Complètes*, *reviewed*, 41-69.

Layman's (A Catholic) Letters addressed to the *Tablet*, *reviewed*, 125-140.

L'Encyclique et les Evêques de France, *noticed*, 536, 537.

Les Actes Pontificaux cités dans l'Encyclique, *noticed*, 533, 534.

Littledale (Richard Frederick), *Unity and the Rescript*, *noticed*, 242.

Lothian (Marquis of), the Confederate Secession, *reviewed*, 328, 372.

Loundes (R.), *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Primary Reliefs*, *noticed*, 547, 548.

MADAME DE MAINTENON, 70-107 ; conspicuous position of female characters in French history, and in particular Madame de Maintenon, 70, 71 ; her birth, family, and first marriage, 72, 74 ; death of Scarron, 75, 76 ; period of widowhood, 77 ; tutelage of Madame de Maintenon's children, 78, 80 ; ennobled by the king, and attached to the court of the dauphiness, 81, 82 ; growth of her influence over Louis XIV., 82, 83 ; married to him, 84 ; her character and conduct, 85, 90 ; foundation of St. Cyr, 90, 93 ; quietism, 93, 95 ; Madame de Maintenon's relations with the royal family, 95, 96 ; Condé at Chantilly, 96, 97 ; Madame de Maintenon's friends, 97, 98 ; dangerous illness of the king, 98, 100 ; flight of James II. and consequent events, 100, 103 ; the campaigns in Flanders, 104 ; Marie Adelaide of Savoy, 105 ; general view of Madame de Maintenon's character, 106, 107.

Maintenon (Madame de), the Life of, *reviewed*, 70-107.

Malines, Congress of, 234.

Mallac, Vie de Madame Louise, *noticed*, 239, 240.

Manning (Henry Edward, D.D.), *The Workings of the Holy Spirit in the Church of England*, a Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, *noticed*, 230-234.

——— *Essays on Religion and Literature*, edited by, *noticed*, 530, 533.

——— *Omnia pro Christo*, a Sermon, *noticed*, 556.

Meditations on the Passion, *noticed*, 250.

Meeker (Mrs. Ogden), *Fortune's Football* ; a Historical Tale, *noticed*, 247, 248.

MEMORIAL OF CARDINAL WISEMAN, 267, 278 ; death of his Eminence the greatest event concerning English Catholics since the restoration of the Hierarchy, 267 ; his particular relations with the DUBLIN REVIEW, 267, 270 ; his career in England, its beginning and its end, 271, 273 ; general respect and sympathy of the people, 273, 274 ; public mourning and funeral procession, 274, 276 ; the "unrecognized Church," 277 ; the sentiments excited in the English people by the Cardinal's death and burial, 278.

MISSAL for the Laity, *reviewed*, 1-20.

Month, the, *noticed*, 250 ; 557.

MOREL (Abbé Jules), *Les Catholiques Libéraux*, *noticed*, 538, 542.

MURRAY (Dr.), his *Treatise on the Church*, *noticed*, 559.

NAPOLEON III., Emperor of the French, his *Vie de César*, 550.

NOAILLES (Le Duc de), *Histoire de Madame de Maintenon*, *reviewed*, 70-107.

OAKELEY (Very Rev. Canon), *Appendix to a Letter on University Education*, *reviewed*, 125-140.

— Historical Notes on the Tractarian Movement, 250.

— On the position of a Catholic Minority, *noticed*, 532, 533.

ORLÉANS (Mgr. l'Evêque de), *Discours sur l'Enseignement Populaire*, *noticed*, 234, 239.

— La Convention du 15 Septembre et L'Encyclique du 8 Décembre, *noticed*, 534, 536.

PARISIS (Mgr.), *Cas de Conscience*, 67.

PENNÉE (Georgina), *The Canadians of Old*, translated by, 248.

PII PAPÆ IX. *Epistola Encyclica*, Dec. 8, 1864, *reviewed*, 441, 499.

Political Society and the Source of Power, 279, 302.

POSSOZ (Père), *Le Premier Jésuite Anglais Martyrisé*, *noticed*, 549, 550.

PRINCIPLES, THE, OF '89 (Second Conference), 279, 302 ; possibility of filling up the breach between the Church and the Revolution, 279 ; end of political society, 280 ; S. Thomas and Bellarmine on the political community, 282 ; opinions of Hobbes and Rousseau, 283 ; true scope of civil society, 284, 285 ; its immediate end, 286, 287 ; "right of resistance to oppression" discussed, 287, 290 ; relation between despotism and democracy, 291 ; Catholic qualifications of lawful resistance, 292, 293 ; the principles of '89 and the English Constitution, 293, 294 ; the origin of political power, 294 ; the supreme power always supreme whatever the form of government, 295, 296 ; derivation of sovereignty from God, 297, 299 ; doctrine of Suarez, 299 ; question of the ruler's responsibility to God or to the nation, 300, 302.

PURTON (William, M.A.), *Philocalia*, *noticed*, 245, 247.

PUSEY (Rev. E. B.), *Mgr. Manning's Letter* to, 230.

QUINET (Edgar), *Histoire de la Campagne de 1815*, *reviewed*, 141-170.

RAMIÈRE (Rev. H., S. J.), *The Apostleship of Prayer*, *noticed*, 243.

RAWES (Rev. H. A.), *Cui bono ? University Education*, *reviewed*, 125-140.

— Sursum, or Sparks Flying Upward ; Great Truths in Little Words, &c., *noticed*, 249, 250.

RAWLINS (Charles E.), *American Disunion Constitutional or Unconstitutional*, *reviewed*, 328, 372.

R. D. O., *The Irish Question*, *reviewed*, 423, 440.

Recueil des Allocutions Consistoriales, &c., *noticed*, 533, 534.

RECENT IRISH POETRY, 302, 328 ; fortunes of the Young Ireland party, 302, 304 ; the Young Ireland poetry, 304, 307 ; criticism of Mr. Ferguson's

poetry, 307, 315 ; of Lady Wilde's poetry, 315, 320 ; of Mr. William Allingham's "Laurence Bloomfield in Ireland," 320, 323 ; of Mr. Aubrey de Vere's "Inisfail," 323, 327 ; the "Spirit of the Nation," and Mr. Gavan Duffy's "Ballad Poetry of Ireland," 327 ; Mr. Florence McCarthy's and Mr. Thomas Irwin's poems, 327, 328.

Rio (A. F.), Shakespeare, *reviewed*, 21-41.

RIO'S SHAKESPEARE, 21-41 : difficulty of determining whether Shakespeare was a Protestant or Catholic, 21, 22 ; opinions of Mr. Carlyle, Goethe, Schiller, Vehse, Vischer, Gervinus, Heine, Malone, Halliwell, Knight, 22 ; Papers on the subject in the *Rambler*, 23 ; M. Rio's opinion, 23 ; state of the external evidence upon the subject, 23, 24 ; the Shakespeare family, 25 ; Shakespeare's personal character, 26 ; internal evidence furnished by his plays, 27 ; critical examination of M. Rio's theory, 28-33 ; his sketch of English poetry and the English drama in Shakespeare's time, 33, 34 ; his comments on Shakespeare's principal plays in detail, 34, 40 ; apparent weakness of his reasoning from the utterances of the poet to the character of the man, 40 ; Shakespeare died a Catholic, 41.

Robertson (Professor), Lectures on Some Subjects of Modern History and Biography, 41.

Rock (Canon), Essay on the Golden Frontal at Milan, *noticed*, 531.

SAINT-CYR, Mémorial de, *reviewed*, 70-107.

Sermons on the Reunion of Christendom, by Members of the Roman Catholic, Oriental, and Anglican Communions, *noticed*, 227-230.

Suarez, Doctrine on Political Power, 299.

Syllabus complectens præcipuos nostri ætatis errores, *reviewed*, 441, 499.

"TABLET," The, R. D. O.'s Letters to, *reviewed*, 423, 440.

Taparelli d'Azeglio (Padre) Essai Théorique de Droit Naturel basé sur les faits, 279.

Text and Translation of the Encyclical and Syllabus, 501, 530.

Theiner (Augustinus), Vetera Monumenta Hibernorum et Scotorum Historiam illustrantia, *reviewed*, 372, 395.

THEINER'S MATERIALS OF IRISH HISTORY, 372, 395 : Survey of Mgr. Theiner's literary labours, 372, 373 ; the present volume a first instalment of the Irish documents in the Vatican, 373 ; scantiness of the documents, 374 ; reasons of this, 375 ; evidence as to the original Roman character of the Irish Church, 376, 378 ; conduct of Rome towards the native and the English clergy, 378, 380 ; light cast by Mgr. Theiner's researches on the history of Irish dioceses, 381, 386 ; the history of the Trinitarian order in Ireland, by Lopez, 386, 388 ; extraordinary heresy in the fourteenth century, 389 ; Ireland and the Western schism, 389, 390 ; letters of Henry VIII. contained in this collection, 390, 394 ; prospects of valuable further results from Mgr. Theiner's labours, 395.

Thiers (M.A.), Waterloo, *reviewed*, 141-170.

THIERS'S WATERLOO, 141-170 : Difficulty of M. Thiers's task, 141, 142 ; his estimate of the relative strength of Napoleon's and the Allied armies, 143, 144 ; relative loss in men and standards, 145 ; outline of M. Thiers's

account of the battle, 145, 147; Napoleon's military position complicated by his political necessities, 148; constitution of the several armies, 148, 149; their special advantages and opportunities, 150, 151; circumstances affecting the result of the battle, 152, 154; survey of the principal strategic movements, 154, 164; criticism of M. Thiers's narrative, 164, 166; Wellington's real tactics, 166, 167; the necessities of Napoleon's position, 168-170; Prussian critics, 170.

Thomas (Saint), on the nature of the political community, 282.

ULLATHORNE (Right Rev. Bishop), A Letter on the Association for Promoting the Unity of Christendom, *noticed*, 227, 230.

UNIVERSITY QUESTION, THE, 125-140: consideration of Canon Oakley's arguments, 126, 133; discussion of the Catholic Layman's explanations, 133, 135; review of Father Rawes's book, 135, 140.

WALKER (Mr.), his translation of the Encyclical and Syllabus, *noticed*, 559.

WANTED A POLICY FOR IRELAND, 423-440: character of recent debates and discussions of Irish affairs, 423, 425; what Ireland really wants from England, 425; obstacles on the part of Ministers and of Parliament itself, 426, 428; assimilation of Irish and English legislation, 428; taxation question, 429, 430; Mr. Disraeli's picture of Ireland, 430; the Belfast riots, 431; the present Irish executive, 431, 432; general view of a proper policy for the government of Ireland, 433, 436; present disturbed condition of the Irish public mind, 436; the chances of an insurrection, 437, 439; the bishops and the new National Association, 439, 440.

What does it Profit a Man? University Education and the Memorialists *noticed*, 543, 546.

Wilde (Lady), Poems, *reviewed*, 315, 320.

Wiseman (His Eminence Cardinal), Sermons, *reviewed*, 192-213.

——— Papers read to the Academia, *noticed*, 530.

——— Obituary Sermons, 556.

